SPEECHES

BY

BABU SURENDRA NATH BANERJEA

VOL. III.

EDITED BY

RAJ JOGESHUR MITTER

SECOND EDITION

Calcutta:

S. K. LAHIRI & Co.,

54, COLLEGE STREET

1905

Calcutta:
GUPTA, MUKHERJEE & CO.,
86, COLLEGE STREET.

To

Maharaj-Kumar BINOY KRISHNA BAHADUR,

SHOVABAZAR.

SIR,

It is with feelings of deep respect and admiration that I venture to dedicate this work embodying some of the highest efforts of oratory of one of the most well-known and gifted of your countrymen in a collected shape. There is a certain appropriateness in dedicating this work, which contains the best and most earnest exposition of the political and national upheaval in our midst, to you, who called by nature to an exalted position in society, have fully accepted the duties and responsibilities of that position by your acquired abilities, broad-hearted sympathies, with the less fortunately situated among your countrymen and by a noble life and exemplary character. The illustrious heads of your family have been in generations past, the centre of all the intellectual, social and political revolution in Bengal, and you have inherited from your illustrious progenitors the highest traditions of generous encouragement of and sympathy with, the heart-felt aspirations of the millions in Bengal. In early life you have shewn the promise of a noble future. You have taken interest in all that is going on around you and have taken a sober and practical view of the concerns of the masses of your countrymen. You have in a special manner befriended the movement to the literature of which this

volume will be a no mean contribution. Though belong ing to the highest aristocratic family in Calcutta, you have mixed in familiar and intimate relations with the representatives of the people and encouraged to the best of your abilities their fondest aspirations. To you, therefore, I respectfully dedicate this volume as a mark of my sincere admiration for your many and varied qualities of head and heart, which I trust are destined to leave their mark

Yours most obediently,

RAJ JOGESHUR MITTER.

BHOWANIPORE,
The 5th Nov. 1890.

PREFACE.

THE extent to which inane public speaking has been carried on in our day has well merited the vehement denunciation which Carlyle poured on it in his essay "Stump Orator." But there are speeches and speeches and good speeches are certainly rare enough to justify their publication in a form that will give them a fair lease of life and this must be our apology for the republication of Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea's speeches—if indeed any apology is needed. That Babu Surendra Nath has the faculty of "really excellent speech," as the sage of Chelsea would say, no one can doubt who has had the privilege of hearing him. The wealth of experience he has gained in his various capacities as politician, journalist and educationist, gives him a right to be heard and considered on questions of public welfare, more especially as his intimate acquaintance with English public opinion gleaned from several visits to England, has helped to remove a too exclusively Indian view of Indian problems and to impart to his views on such problems a wide and liberal tone with regard to the interests of the British Empire at large.

Theodore Parker has said with great felicity that a "single man like Socrates was of more worth to a country than many such States as South Carolina; that if that State went out of the world to-day, she would not have done so much for the world as Socrates."

Carlyle has similarly maintained that England would sustain a far greater loss were Shakespeare to be forgotten than if her whole Indian Empire were to pass away from her rule. There is no doubt a tendency in certain classes of Native opinion to over-estimate the value of India to England, but at the same time there is an equally unfortunate tendency in Anglo-Indian opinion to greatly under-estimate the importance of India to England. It seems to us that Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea has steered clear of either of these tendencies; and in his utterances he has adopted a happy mean between the two which cannot but commend itself to all impartial minds. Every honest and straightforward attempt to discuss Indian problems in a spirit which while recognising the claims of the Indian peoples to a fair share in the administration of their country, is at the same time careful to keep in view the interests of England, ought to be encouraged. And this in our opinion Babu Surendra Nath has not only carefully attempted to do but has succeeded in doing.

The indifference displayed with regard to Indian affairs by the majority of Englishmen is due no doubt, not to any deliberate intention on their part to shelve Indian affairs, but to the lack of Indians who have the means and the ability of making the Indian problem at once interesting and instructive. If there were more Indians capable of showing that the political aspirations of the people are not mere discontents which arise from a want of appreciation of the benefits conferred by English rule in this land, but on the other hand are the natural and inevitable results of the law of human pro-

gress, the political problem in India would meet with more sympathy from Englishmen. In this direction Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea has done a good deal to make India more interesting by his lectures and speeches. His thorough acquaintance with the language and literature and modes of thought of Englishmen makes him an invaluable help in the cause he has espoused.

It will be noticed that the speeches delivered in England deal mostly with the same subject, viz., the question of political enfranchisement in India. The subject is certainly a very important one and we do not think that too much can be said regarding it. It does not therefore appear to us necessary to apologise for publishing so much on the same subject even at the risk of being monotonous. But Babu Surendra Nath is never monotonous even when speaking over and over again on the same subject. He has the capacity of presenting the same subject in so many different ways and in so many different lights that he never loses interest.

In conclusion it is only necessary to add that however one may differ from him politically there can be no doubt that all Babu Surendra Nath's utterances have been dictated by what he sincerely believes to be for the good alike of England and of India. There is a very unfortunate tendency rampant in this country to regard all who differ from stereotyped ways of thinking as windbags. This intolerance is much to be regretted. It is a decided gain to be able to treat political opponents with charity, and it would be well

if both parties—the party for and the party against India's political emancipation—kept this constantly in mind. Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea possesses this moderation in a marked degree; and it is this that gives to his speeches apart from any intrinsic value they may possess an interest which cannot fail to attract the notice of the political observer. Many of Babu Surendra Nath's speeches have been delivered on Anglo-Indian platforms: a fact which if it shows anything at all, shows pretty clearly that there is no want of good feeling between the several classes of Her Majesty's subjects where common interests are concerned. Let us hope that in the endeavour to expand these common interests and to strengthen the bonds of sympathy between the rulers and the ruled, Babu Surendra Nath will be eminently successful.

RAJ JOGESHUR MITTER.

CONTENTS.

THE INCOME TAX BILL.

A requisition most numerously and influentially signed having been made to the Sheriff of Calcutta for convening a public meeting of the inhabitants of Calcutta and its Suburbs in order to protest against the imposition of the Income Tax, a public meeting was held at the Town Hall on Thursday the 28th January 1886, under the presidency of Mr. George Yule, the then Sheriff of Calcutta.

MR. JOHN PITT-KENNEDY, Barrister-at-Law, moved and Mr. Larmour, a late Master of the Trades Association, seconded the following Resolution :—

1. That this meeting deeply regrets that it should have been proposed to incorporate the Income Tax (which has been condemned by eminent Indian authorities and which in its practical operation in this country has always been attended with more or less oppression) into the permanent fiscal system of the country without an attempt being made to curtail expenditure or to meet the expected deficit and equalise the incidence of taxation from other and less objectionable sources of taxation. This meeting accordingly desires to place on record its respectful but emphatic protest against the proposal to impose an Income-tax in the way and under the circumstances under which it is proposed to impose it.

BABU SURENDRA NATH BANERJEE in supporting the above resolution spoke as follows :—

Mr. Sheriff and Gentlemen,—I have been requested to support the resolution which has just been moved and seconded. In doing so, permit me to offer my congratulations to the promoters of this movement for having for the first time after the termination of a somewhat acrimonious and uphappy controversy (hear, hear) brought together the representatives of the European and Native communities upon the same common

platform of united political action. (Cheers.) India for the Indians and for England is our motto. India exists for the benefit of her own people, and the Government ought to be so conducted as to be a source of abiding glory to that country, with whose fortunes our own are indissolubly linked together. (Cheers.) I am emboldened in this hope of future united action by what has recently happened. The Chamber of Commerce of this city, representing in this matter no doubt not only the sense of the mercantile community but of the entire non-official European public throughout the country, have addressed a memorial to the Secretary of the State praying that no Member of the House of Commons should be appointed to sit on the Parliamentary Committee of enquiry into Indian affairs, who has had anything to do directly or indirectly with the administration of this country. I am sure that in this matter the Chamber have faithfully reflected the sense of the entire Indian community. (Cheers.) The Committee will be a farce if it is to comprise the pensioned officers of the Government, who with their so-called Indian experience, which oftentimes means prejudice (laughter), will meet to vindicate their own administration. We have met here to protest. It is possible that our protest will be ineffectual. (Cries of no, no.) I am glad to hear these cries from that part of the hall. But I wish the gentleman could give us his assurance with some degree of authority. It is possible that before 24 hours have elapsed the Bill will have become the law of the land. We are under no delusion. We are fully alive to our own humiliating position. We are fully impressed with the impotency of popular opinion in India to stay the arm—the irresistible arm—of autocratic power. (Cheers.) But the community owes a duty to itself, to enter its protest, at once firm and respectful, against a measure which was conceived in haste, which is being carried through with reckless precipitancy, and which, when it has become the law of the land, will fill the country with sufferings, the echoes

of which will not perhaps reach the ears of our rulers in the cool retreats of Simla, but which will perceptibly add to the mass of popular discontent and to the accumulated embarrassment of the Government. (Cheers.) But why do we protest? Is it because we are called upon to pay? To be taxed, I thought, was the particular privilege of the British subject. But to grumble is even a higher privilege. (Laughter.) Among the many things which our rulers have taught us, the art of grumbling is not to be despised. (Renewed laughter.) But do we grumble for mere grumbling's sake? We have a legitimate grievance, an unredressed wrong, a just ground of complaint, which we are prepared to submit to the crucible of examination and scrutiny. Let it not go forth from this meeting that we desire to escape the legitimate burdens of imperial rule. (Hear, hear.) We are the subjects of the proudest empire in the world. We glory in that imperial connection which makes us the participators of that noble heritage of freedom which is the birth-right of every Englishman. (Loud Cheers.) Let the Russians come if they choose. They will find behind the serried ranks of one of the grandest armies in the world the countless millions of a loyal people, united by contentment, by gratitude, by willingness for self-sacrifice, ready to guard an empire that has meant in India the establishment of peace, the diffusion of knowledge, and which I trust will yet mean the political enfranchisement of her vast people. (Cheers.) Last year when the empire was menaced, a spectacle was presented such as the world had never before witnessed. The princes and the peole hastened with their loyal offers of help—the princes with their armies—the people with offers of personal service as volunteers. The Government did not think fit to accept the offer of the people. But this does not look like a shirking of our sense of imperial responsibilities. We are fully alive to them. We would gladly bear our burden. But what we complain of is that as far as this new burden of an income-tax is concerned, no case has been made out for it.

We hold that before the Government is at liberty to introduce an Income-tax Bill, it must show that it has tried and exhausted every available means, and that as a last resort it has recourse to an Income-tax. (Cheers.) We have heard an eulogium passed upon the Income-tax by the chairman of the meeting. Theoretically, no doubt the tax is unobjectionable. Everybody contributes towards the expenses of the State, according to the measure of his income. Nothing could be more satisfactory—nothing more correct in principle. But in this unhappy world there is such a wide divergence between theory and practice that what may appear unimpeachable in principle may be open to serious objection in actual practice. (Hear, hear.) My friend, Mr. Larmour, has referred to a number of cases of oppression which took place on the last occasion when the Income-tax was imposed. How many hundreds of cases there have been which have not found their way into the newspapers, where the sufferers silently bore their cruel wrongs. (Cheers.) The minimum of taxable income has been fixed at Rs. 500. But how many persons, in the remote mofussil, entitled by law to exemption, will have to bribe the underlings of the tax-gatherer, in order to obtain that immunity which the law allows them? And how few of these cases will ever see the light of day or reach the ears of our rulers? The Income-tax has been tried and has been deliberately abandoned, and now it is proposed to re-impose it, without an attempt to curtail expenditure or to meet the expected deficit from other and less objectionable sources. And therefore it is that we have met here in such large numbers to protest against the tax. Is not curtailment of expenditure feasible? And is it not urgently needed in the interests of the Empire? Our financial situation has been growing from bad to worse every year. I shall ask you to bear with me for a few moments, as I proceed to develop the deplorable record of our finances. Let me ask you to go so far back as the year 1814, and to travel with me from that year up till 1884, covering a

period of nearly seventy years. During this period there has been a deficit of 71 millions sterling, which makes an average of a million every year of deficit. Now let us examine the history of our public debt. The debt in 1814 was 14 millions, in 1860 it was 97 millions, and in the year of grace 1884 it was 160 millions; exclusive of the debt on railways and productive public works. It will thus be seen that for the last 70 years there has been an ever-recurring deficit and an ever-increasing debt. How has this grand result been attained? Let us examine how our money goes, and I promise to take you through a marvel of figures. Some of you who have been to England must have been impressed with that magnificent building which goes under the name of the India Office. That Office, built out of your money, cost the Government £500,000. The India Office having been built, it became necessary to furnish it with a Library, and accordingly a sum of £70,000 was spent in providing it with a library, though you may note in passing that your own public library has been reduced almost to a state of ruins. Our rulers now thought of having a Store Depot, and a sum of £68,000 was spent in erecting one. It occurred to the Indian authorities that they should have an Engineering College in England and a sum of £100,000 was spent in building a College. But there is one item which seems to me the most curious of all, and which I confess I have not been able to explain. I find an item of £ 30,000 spent upon erecting a Lunatic Asylum at Ealing! It is difficult to understand why this money should have been spent out of the Indian Exchequer, except on the assumption—the somewhat uncharitable assumption, though nevertheless the perfectly natural assumption—that some of our rulers after their exciting lives in India may need the quiet shelter of these sanctuaries to resume the even tenor of their minds. (Loud laughter and tremendous applause.) But let us proceed. We are aware that our rulers are very fond of decorating themselves and their friends and sometime their families. Now the

extension of the Order of the Star of India within 5 years has cost the Government a sum of £ 13,900. Lord Lytton after the expiry of his Indian career had to be carried home; and what do you think was the expense of the trip to England? It cost the Government more than £ 5,000. Now many of you gentlemen here are constantly going backwards and forwards from this country to England, and I put it to you to say whether you spend Rs. 50,000 upon such a purpose in the whole course of your Indian career? The Cooper's Hill College is maintained at a dead loss of £5,000 a year. I could multiply items, but these will be sufficient to show how our money is sometimes spent. And is not curtailment possible, and is it not desirable? Why do they not stop the yearly migration to the Hills? Why should it be necessary for Heads of Departments, and indeed for Heads of Subordinate Governments, to go to the Hills to recoup their health accompanied by a host of clerks? We are of course prepared to make an exception in favor of His Excellency the Viceroy, who is usually a statesman past the middle period of life. I am not going to go over the ground travelled by Mr. Pitt Kennedy, but there is one remark which he as a lawyer, it seems to me, might have very aptly made. If the Judges of the land can sweat and toil in the plains during the hot summer months without prejudice to their health or to the efficiency of their work, there is no reason why our other magnates should need a trip to the Hills every year to recoup their health and energy? I will, however, ask you gentlemen to consider with me for a few moments the question of military expenditure, in regard to which, I hold, considerable economy is possible. Let me compare the numercial strength and the cost of the army of India with those of European countries, and it will be found from the figures which I shall presently state and which are taken from the *Statesman's Year-book of facts for* 1885, and not from the columns of a petty vernacular journalist (laughter and cheers), that ours is the most expensive army in the world.

Here are the figures :—

	Men.	Annual Cost.
Austro-Hungarian Army ...	2,72,400	£8,381,733
France	5,24,797	£28,652,740
Germany	4,49,329	£16,993,624
Italy	7,50,765	£8,456,438
Russia	7,29,770	£19,655,757
Turkey	3,10,000	£4,009,679
India	1,90,476	£16,975,750

What is the cost per head? Austria pays £30 per man, France 54, Germany 38, Italy 12, Russia 27 and Turkey 12. The Indian army consists of 1,90,476 soldiers, Europeans and Natives, costing 17 millions sterling, that is to say £90 per head! So that India has to pay per annum for one fighting man nearly one and three-quarter times as much, or 64 per cent. as France, which possesses the largest army in Europe, next to Italy and Russia, on the peace footing, and pays most dearly for it.

And how has this increase of military expenditure been brought about? In every case it does not represent an increase of efficiency. From 1864 to 1884, an addition of £800,000 has been made to the military expenditure of the empire. A few items will demonstrate the character of this increase :—

In 1864-65 increased rates of pay were granted to medical officers of the British service in India, amounting to £20,000 a year; and a revised scale of clothing and compensation to the British army was introduced costing £20,000 a year.

In 1865-66 increased rates of pay granted to veterinary surgeons, amounting to £3,500 a year.

In 1874-75 the revised rates of pay of British troops in India added to the estimates £64,000 a year.

In 1875-76 the grant of pay of rank to Majors of Royal Artillery and Engineers in India created a new annual charge of £27,000.

In 1876-77 the increased pay of non-commissioned officers and lance ranks amounted to £40,000 a year.

The Government of India in vain protested against this increase in its despatch of the 21st November 1884. Let me quote an extract from that Despatch. "These additional charges," observed the Government, "amount to more than £800,000 a year. Some of them were necessary for improvements; others were imposed with little or no reference to Indian wants, and in most cases without the Indian Government having any voice in the matter."

Such is the way in which our money is spent. Additional pay is given to the British soldier, to the British officer, to Veterinary Surgeons and others, and when the responsible rulers of India protest, the protest is not heeded. Suppose £800,000 had not been thus added to the military expenditure of the Empire, why we need not have paid an Income-tax now; for the Income-tax is levied to raise a sum of less than £800,000 a year.

But if it was impossible to curtail expenditure, why did they not have recourse to other and less objectionable sources of taxation? What was there to prevent the re-imposition of the import duties? Were these duties a tax upon the poor? Mr. Mandlik's facts and figures have completely dissipated that delusion. Were they protective in their operation? They were imposed long before the Bombay mills were established. They were levied for financial purposes. Mr. Gladstone might be presumed to be a champion of free trade, and what did he say of these duties, from his place in the House of Commons: "What an invidious, almost odious picture of inequality we exhibit to the millions of India! The free-trade doctrines that we hold so dear, that we apply them against the feelings of the Indian people in their utmost rigor and without a grain of mercy, disappear in a moment when it is a question of dealing with those whose interest and opinions we cannot lightly

tamper with; namely, the free colonists of this empire. The Governor-General says, he cannot see that financial difficulty can in any way be pleaded as a reason against what he calls fiscal reform. If that be a true principle of government, it has been discovered for the first time by the present Viceroy (Lord Lytton). There has not been a free-trade Government in this or any country, which has not freely admitted that the state of the revenue is an essential element in the consideration of the application even of the best principles of free-trade."

Such is our case, and I put it to this meeting to say whether with these facts before us an Income-tax Bill would have the slightest chance of becoming law, if the popular element had any voice in the legislation of the country? We are called upon to pay, but we have no voice in matters of taxation. The position is painfully humiliating. The evil indeed is far too deep-seated to be cured by a formal protest. We must insist upon the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils, with power over taxation. The Ceylon Legislative Council possesses such a power; and why should the Indian Councils be without it? The Government must note the signs of the times. A great wave of reform has swept over the country. New hopes and new ideas have been created in the popular mind. These must be satisfied. The wide divergence between popular aspirations and the existing administrative institutions of the country must be bridged over, and nothing short of a remodelling of the Legislative Councils upon a popular and representative basis will satisfy the new-born instincts of the people or remove those grievances of which we justly complain (Loud cheers).

THE EXODUS TO THE HILLS.

In compliance with a requisition made to him, a public meeting of the inhabitants of Calcutta was convened by the Sheriff (Mr. George Yule) on Wednesday the 14th July 1886, for the purpose of protesting against the annual migration of the Government to the Hills. The Honorable Sir Alexander Wilson, Kt. moved the second Resolution, which ran as follows :—

"That this Meeting condemns the location of the Indian Administrations in the Hills, upon, amongst others, the following grounds :—

(1) that it involves an unnecessary aad wasteful outlay of the public revenues ;

(2) that it involves a very serious and unnecessary waste of the public time, and therefore it is to the prejudice of the public service and public interests generally ;

(3) that it causes severe hardship to all classes of public servants affected by it, except those in the highest grades and in the receipt of the highest emoluments ;

(4) that it reverses the accepted principle upon which salaries in India have been fixed at rates which are exceptionally high, as compared with the remuneration paid to public servants in England, the Colonies, or, indeed, in any other country ;

(5) that it rests upon an exaggerated notion of the unsuitability of the Indian climate for Englishmen—a notion contradicted by all the facts of the British occupation of the country, by the experience of the contemporaries of the officials who form the Head-Quarters Staffs of the different Governments, and by the experience of the whole body of the European non-official community ;

(6) that it deprives the Legislature of India of the services of the non-official members of the Legislative Council, and for a large part of the year converts that Council into a purely official Committee—a result not intended or contemplated by the Act establishing that Council ;

(7) that it removes the Government of India from touch with the communities it has to govern, and makes it less well acquainted with the actual and practical requirements of the people and the country;

(8) that it denies the principle that Governments should be located at points where the central authority is most secure and is best able in the event of an emergency to move with the greatest readiness the full resources of the State;

(9) that it is a custom a parallel to which can be furnished by no other country in the world;

(10) and finally, that it is a practice which has been condemned upon military, political, and administrative grounds by the highest authorities who have considered it."

BABU SURENDRA NATH BANERJEE, in seconding the above Resolution, spoke as follows :—

Mr. Sheriff, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I have great pleasure in seconding the Resolution which has been so ably moved by my leader. This spectacle of united action on the part of the different communities of this great city will not fail to impress the Government of India, as I am sure it will not fail to influence the course of public opinion in England. The Meeting is significant in more ways than one. It has a historical importance of its own. I look beyond the immediate object and scope of the Meeting. We are not met here merely to protest against these yearly migrations. I conceive we have a much higher and nobler object in view. We have met here to bury in oblivion the bitter memory of a controversy that is now happily past and gone (cheers); and the like of which I hope and trust will never again occur in our annals (Cheers). We have met here to renew those bonds of amity and good-will which ought to subsist between communities which have so many interests in common, and upon whose harmony and mutual sympathy depend the best interests of Indian political advancement (Loud cheers). And lastly, we have met here to re-affirm, by this grand and united demonstration, the pledges of a friendship, interrupted but not broken, and which I trust will grow with the growth of time, until we in India have

obtained for ourselves those rights and privileges which are the inalienable heritage of British subjects in all other parts of Her Majesty's dominions (Loud cheers). Such I conceive to be the true significance of this Meeting. Such will be the import which the future historian will attach to it. It is the first open and striking illustration of returning concord and harmony between the European and the Native communities. May this feeling grow and increase for the benefit of India and the glory of England! (Hear, hear). There are many questions of burning importance which await solution, but which are not likely to be pressed home upon the attention of the Government except by the earnest representations of a united community. Take, for instance, that question of the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils. There never was a greater farce of an institution than those Legislative Councils (Cheers). There they meet in the Council Chambers to register the decrees of an omnipotent Executive Government (Hear, hear), and our non-official members are summoned to add to the dignity of the ceremony of law-making (Cheers). Beyond that I do not conceive they serve any useful purpose. They exercise a vague, remote, impalpable kind of moral influence which at times is so dim that it vanishes to the limits of a mathematical point (Laughter). Now all this must be changed. Yes, Europeans and Natives of the country must stand shoulder to shoulder in fighting the great battle of Indian representation (Cheers).

The Resolution sets forth the grounds upon which we take exception to the yearly migrations to the Hills, and it does so with admirable clearness and precision, and I feel the less hesitation in saying so, seeing that I have had no hand in the drafting of the Resolution, but that the credit of it belongs entirely to my friend, Mr. Clarke, of the Chamber of Commerce. The Resolution naturally enough puts forward the financial ground first, as being one of the most important, if not, indeed, the most important. The finances form the backbone of an

administration. "Tell me," said Mr. Bright in one of his great speeches, "what the financial administration of a country is, and I will tell you all about its government, the condition and happiness of its people." The remark applies in a special sense to the circumstances of India. Ours is the poorest country in the world. It is no longer the gorgeous Ind which attracted the cupidity of a Semiramis, a Darius or an Alexander (Loud cheers). Dr. Hunter, the Director-General of Statistics, has somewhere remarked that nearly one-half of our vast population live upon one meal a day. The picture is not overdrawn. A high official in the position of Dr. Hunter is not likely to overdraw a picture of this kind, which if true, would reflect such grave discredit upon the Government under which he serves. Gentlemen, you are not familar with the state of things in the moffusil. I claim to have some knowledge of the subject. I have visited the Bengal peasant in his cottage. I have conversed with him, and I have heard from his own lips the sad tale of his misery—the story of his starving children, his famished cattle, his wasted fields, the burden of taxation which he can no longer bear, and the still heavier burden that is imposed upon him, so that he may obtain immunity from the grip of the tax-gatherer in respect of taxation, towards which he is not called upon to contribute by the laws of the land. And from my intimate knowledge of the Bengal peasant, I can truly say that his lot is far more miserable, and therefore far more pitiable, than that of the Irish peasant. Language barely suffices to describe the depth of his poverty or the extent of his misery. Such are your tax-payers. Such is the bulk of those whose contributions make up the revenues of the Empire. It is the bounden duty of every Government to economize its resources. Much more is that duty incumbent on a Government situated as the Government of India is, with a population sunk in the deepest depths of abject poverty (Cheers). But can it be said that Government is economical—that it saves a penny where a penny can be saved? I fear we

must hold that the Government delights in wasteful extravagance; and these Simla picnics and these yearly migrations are evidence in point. You have heard read to you the figures, which are imperfectly given, because the Government does not venture to disclose the real state of its finances. What do these figures disclose? They show that the tour expenses of the different Governments of India for a period of eight years, extending from 1876-77 to 1883-84, came up to over £8,92,000. In other words, in eight years, the Government has spent nearly a crore of rupees, or more, taking the high rate of exchange which has prevailed for the last few years, upon these yearly migrations. The tour expenses of the different Governments of India thus come up to about 12 lakhs of rupees a year. Now, this represents a very considerable outlay, considering what our financial position is, and how only six months ago the Government was driven to the last desperate expedient of imposing the most unpopular of all forms of taxation—the Income Tax (Cheers). Now on the eve of the imposition of the Income Tax, a Committee was appointed—a Committee for the reduction of expenditure. I presume this was intended as a sop to the Cerberus of public opinion (Hear, hear). It was at first to have been a Commission—it soon dwindled down into a Committee, and it is now flourishing as such. The Committee have commenced work and have made some suggestions. It is understood that they have suggested the abolition of the Original Side of the High Court, which my lawyer friends here are well able to take care of (laughter); and they have also recommended the enforcement of the two-thirds rule as regards the pay of Native officials. But it does not appear that they have even remotely suggested the discontinuance of the migrations to the Hills. On the contrary, it is rumoured that they have recommended the permanent location of the Secretariat Offices attached to the Government of India in the Hills. No doubt, this would be exceedingly pleasant to the higher officials, as it would be exceedingly

hard upon the poor clerks; and as far as the Bengalee clerks are concerned, it would mean their virtual dismissal (A voice—Quiet true). The climate does not agree with them. The allowances do not cover their expenses. Only last year, two or three Bengalee clerks died through the effects of the climate; and the other day, a clerk, in passing through the Bankruptcy Court, declared that he had been brought to that condition owing to the expenses that had been entailed upon him consequent upon his journey to Simla and his stay there. I must say that I cannot admire the humanity or the wisdom of a proposal of this nature. There are a thousand directions in which economy is possible, and to these I would invite the attention of the Finance Committee. The Home charges might be reduced; the military expenditure might be curtailed, and the salaries of high officials might be cut down, especially in view of these yearly migrations. I have no hesitation in saying that high officials in this country draw exorbitant salaries. Take the salaries attached to similar offices in the Colonies—take Ceylon for instance—where the work and the climate are pretty much the same as in India. The comparison is most instructive; and I shall crave your indulgence to bear with me, as I lay before you a few figures in this connection. The Viceroy and Governor-General of India draws a salary of Rs. 2,40,000 a year, exclusive of expenses to which he is entitled out of the Durbar Fund. The Lieutenant-Governors of this and of other provinces draw a salary of Rs. 1,00,000 a year. Now the highest salary given to a Colonial Governor—the salary, for instance, which is given to the Governor of Ceylon, and which used to be drawn by Lord Dufferin as Governor of Canada—is £7,000 or about Rs. 80,000 a year. From the Governors, let us go down to the Secretaries. The Secretaries to the Government of India draw a salary of Rs. 50,000 a year; the Secretaries to the Government of Bengal are entitled to a salary of Rs. 40,000 a year. The Colonial Secretary of Ceylon, who is also a member of the

Ceylon Legislative Council, draws a salary of only Rs. 24,000 a year, which is less than one-half of the salaries drawn by the Secretaries of the Government of India. But let us proceed. The Divisional Commissioners in Bengal draw a salary of about Rs. 38,000 a year. In Ceylon, the Government Agents, whose duties are akin to those of the Divisional Commissioners, are each entitled to a salary of Rs. 17,000 a year, or less than half the Indian salary. Judicial appointments are very important in their nature, and even in this respect, we find the same difference between Ceylon and Bengal. In Bengal, the District Judges are entitled to a salary of from Rs. 25,000 to Rs. 30,000 a year. In Ceylon, the Judges receive a salary of Rs. 14,400 a year. The Public Works Minister in India receives a salary of a lakh of rupees a year. The Director of Public Works in Ceylon draws a salary of Rs. 15,000 a year. The Director of Public Instruction in Bengal receives a salary of Rs. 24,000 a year. The Director of Public Instruction in Ceylon draws a salary of Rs. 10,000, a year. The Inspector-General of Police in Bengal receives a salary of Rs. 30,000 a year. The Inspector-General of Police in Ceylon draws a salary of Rs. 12,000 a year. The Inspector-General of Prisons in Bengal receives a salary of about Rs. 30,000; in Ceylon he draws a salary of Rs. 12,000 a year. One instance more, and I shall have done. The Director-General of Telegraphs in India draws a salary of Rs. 36,000 a year. The Director-General of Telegrahs in Ceylon draws a salary Rs. 14,800 a year (Cheers). I could go on multiplying these instances and keep you here engaged all night with this interesting comparison. But that is not necessary. These instances will suffice, and I do think that if reductions have to be made, the salaries of our high officials should be cut down. But exorbitant as their emoluments are, the yearly migrations completly reverse the accepted principle upon which these high salaries are given. Our high officials are paid these salaries, because it is presumed they have to work in the heat of the plains. But now they

enjoy the advantage of an English climate throughout the year; and to enable them to enjoy this boon, I presume they must needs receive a further remuneration (Laughter and cheers). The logical inconsistency of the thing is simply amazing; and it would long ago have disappeared, but for the deep personal interests concerned.

But the financial aspect is not the only aspect of the question that should be borne in mind. There are other considerations, some of which have already been referred to, which may be urged against the annual migrations to the Hills. Look at the loss of time, the waste of public resources, the unnecessary correspondence, the long-drawn reports that must follow in the train of these yearly migrations. The other day, in consequence of the floods, there was an interruption of railway communication about Umballa, when, for some days, the summer capital of the Empire was cut off from the rest of the Empire. A thing of this kind might happen at any time between June and October; and suppose at such a time a crisis arose on the North-Western Frontiers. What then? I shudder to contemplate the prospect. This was what precisely happened in 1857. When the Mutiny broke out, General Anson, the Commander-in-Chief, was enjoying his holidays at Simla; and before he could descend into the plains, the flames of the Mutiny had spread like wild-fire and had enveloped the whole country in a dreadful conflagration. If there had been timely interference, our country would have been spared the greatest catastrophe it has passed through in modern times. Will not our rulers profit by the lessons of the past? (Hear, hear) Those great men who founded the Indian Empire and whose virtues and heroism consolidated this vast fabric of imperial rule, were strong enough to brave the climate of the plains throughout the year! (Cheers) The Wellesleys, the Mintos, the Bentincks, the Dalhousies never thought of leaving the capital of the Empire for the cool salubrity of the hills (Cheers). It is possible they sacrificed themselves to their

sense of duty. But what an example have they left to the future generations of Indian rulers, and to Englishmen in general? (Hear, Hear) And they delved and toiled in this fashion, wearing away life by inches in the burning plains of Calcutta, at a time when Calcutta was the grave of the white man. And now when Calcutta,—I say so, in the presence of my friend the Secretary to the Health Society,—has become through the efforts of a much maligned Municipality, the health-resort of India—(Loud cheers)—we have the successors of the Cannings, the Bentincks, and the Dalhousies hurrying away at the first approach of the hot weather. What a spectacle of utter demoralization! It was not by such qualities that the Empire was won, and I fear it is not by such qualities that the Empire will be preserved and consolidated. But there are other objections to the Annual Exodus to the Hills. The location of the Government of India in the hills makes the Legislative Council of India a purely official body during the greater part of the year, contrary to the spirit of the Indian Councils Act. The Act requires that at least one-third of the members should be non-officials. But hardly a single non-official member can attend the Council meetings at Simla. As it is, these Councils are great shams. Indian opinion has unanimously condemned them. We are agitating for their reconstitution, and now the Government by its own action makes them greater shams than ever. Years ago, Sir Henry Sumner Maine had given a promise that no important legislative work would be taken up at Simla. It was impossible to keep a promise of this kind, when, for eight months of the year, the Government continued to reside in the Hills; and a memorable departure from that promise took place the other day when the Bankruptcy Law relating to the North-Western Provinces and Oudh was introduced into the Council at Simla. But the greatest objection to the location of the Government in the Hills is the loss of touch which it involves with the communities under its authority. The Government segregates

itself from the influence of public opinion, and becomes a stranger to the wants, views, and aspirations of the people. The Government professes to govern by the light of public opinion, but what can it know of public opinion when it deliberately cuts itself off from the great centres of that opinion? The faintest echoes of a distant public opinion only reach the ears of our rulers at Simla. A disregard of public opinion is thus fostered, which is fatal to the best interests of the rulers and of the ruled.

Such are our objections to these migrations. Will the Government take note of them? Will the Government condescend to listen to them and to lend us an indulgent ear? But whether it will do so or not, I venture to point out, on behalf of this Great Public Meeting, and in the words of the greatest orator of modern times, that when a nation's demand is moderate and reasonable, there is no Government in the world that can resist it. Our Government may be strong in the strength of its inexhaustible resources; it may be great in peace, great in the arts of civilized life—but there is a power higher, nobler, purer far which no physical resources can supply and to which the proudest Government must bend its knee, the power which belongs to the enlightened opinion of a great community (Cheers). It is to that power that we appeal, it is by that power that we are content to be judged. The voice of the people is the voice of God; it is through the hearts and consciences of the people that the Most High holds communion with his creatures. Let Governments beware how they disregard the voice of public opinion. It is a tribunal higher than their own. In Europe it has displaced the strength of armies, the power of aristocracies, the prestige of nations, the resources of party organization, and even the omnipotence of wealth. In India, too, in the words of a great Viceroy, it will soon be enthroned as the irresistible and the unresisted master of the Government.

But whether the Government listens to us or not, we have

a duty in this matter. Well, we are all united, firmly knit together. A common grievance has brought us together upon a common platform. Let us resolve that this union shall continue, that this bond of amity shall endure so long, at any rate, as this grievance is not removed. Let us enter so to speak into a solemn league and covenant, upon which let us invoke the blessings of Almighty God that we shall not rest, but that we shall carry on a ceaseless and persistent agitation here, and, if need be, in England. And if we are firm and united, the victory is ours. Success will come in its own good time. A righteous cause must triumph—such is the ordering of nature, the will of Divine Providence. The time is, indeed, fast approaching when these yearly migrations will soon have become things of the past and a future generation will wonder how ever it was possible for the rulers of a great country in the full possession of their senses to dream of governing a vast Empire away from the centres of population, intelligence, and wealth. This is the riddle of the present hour, and it will be the riddle of the future, towards the solution of which the historian will apply all his energies and all his resources (Loud cheers).

THE SECOND NATIONAL CONGRESS.

At the Second National Congress held at Calcutta (26th—29th December 1886), Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee in moving the Resolution regarding the expansion of the Legislative Councils, spoke as follows.

GENTLEMEN,

I should have preferred if somebody else—some one unconnected with our Province—had been entrusted with the duty of proposing this Resolution. We, the people of Bengal, occupy a peculiar position with reference to this Congress. We have invited the rest of India—the culture, the intelligence and the public spirit of this great Empire—to our city and to this great conference, for the discussion of public questions. We are the hosts and you are our guests, and as hosts it best befits us to restrain our tongues and to stand by while you speak and to listen to the words of wisdom—the collective wisdom of united India—that may fall from your lips. The scene of to-day, and the scenes which we have been witnessing for the last two days,—pardon me for the digression,—remind me of those spectacles in ancient India when the lord of Aryavarta would summon his feudatory chiefs to his capital to celebrate the most imposing of Aryan rites—the Rajsuya Jagya. But those were gatherings of princes, not the gatherings of peoples. Here we have before us personified the incarnate majesty of the nation. What visions of glory, what prospects of rapturous joy unfold themselves before the imagination of the poet, the historian and the philsopher. I will not indulge in them. I will not allow myself to be carried away by the inspiration of the moment. But this I will say—I

may be permitted to indulge in this hope that this feeling of sympathy and brotherhood between the different Indian races may grow and deepen, that it may draw together the most distant parts of the Empire and bind all races, all creeds and all nationalities that inhabit this great country, in one golden chain of brotherly love and fraternal. affection. But there is another reason why I should have preferred that some one, not a native of Bengal, had taken up this Resolution. Whatever agitation takes place, whatever wave of national feeling surges from one part of the country to the other, whatever upheaval of the national mind is observable, manifesting itself in great and imposing popular demonstrations, is ascribed to the instrumentality of the people of Bengal. But I am unwilling that Bengal should take the credit, or the discredit as it may seem to some, of having originated the agitation in connection with this movement. The truth is that all India, with all her races and creeds, is united in making this one common, universal prayer for the introduction of representative government.

Self-Government is the ordering of nature, the will of Divine Providence. Every nation must be the arbiter of its own destinies—such is the omnipotent fiat inscribed by nature with her own hands and in her own eternal book. But do we govern ourselves? The answer is,—No. Are we then living in an unnatural state? Yes,—in the same state in which the patient lives under the ministrations of the physician. We are passing through a period of probation and a period of trial under the auspices of one of the most freedom-loving nations in the world. And we claim that the period of probation may now fairly terminate, that the leading-strings may be taken off, and the child having emerged into the dawn of mature manhood may at any rate be partially entrusted with the management of his own affairs. If it were otherwise, the circumstance would imply the gravest slur upon the character of British rule in India; for it would mean that, after more than a century of

British rule and of English education, we are still unfit to appreciate the principles and to practice the art of Self-Government. But I have no fears on this score. In our own province, Local Self-Government has been remarkably successful. We have it on the highest authority; for no less a personage than His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor has declared that, in Bengal, Local Self-Government has on the whole been a success; and I am quite sure similar testimony would be forthcoming in reference to the other Provinces of India. It would indeed be a marvel, if it were otherwise. Our Punchayet system is as old as the hills, and is graven on the hearts and the instincts of the people. Self-Government is, therefore, nothing new to the habits or the ways of thought of the people of India.

The Resolution with which I am entrusted follows as a matter of course from the 3rd Resolution which you have already adopted. Having affirmed that the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils has become necessary, alike in the interests of the people of India and for the honour of English rule, it becomes necessary for us to determine how the reform should be carried out—what are the lines which should be followed—what are to be the principles upon which it should be based? It will not do to appear before Government, to quote the expressive language of my friend opposite, as the Great Mr. Blank. We must make it clear that we are not mere talkers, that we are not mere brawlers and charlatans, but that we have devoted some of the most precious moments of our life-time, moments of anxious thought and of patient consideration, to the solution of this great problem. Our proposals may be rejected. We put them forward as only tentative suggestions. But that is no concern of ours. The responsibility lies with the Government. And at the very threshold of the enquiry, I desire to remove a difficulty which some may feel in connection with this Resolution. To some it may appear that we are entering too much into details.

But I am prepared to shew, and I hope to able to make it clear as I proceed, that we are dealing with broad general principles, and that the details, such as they may appear to the superficial observer, are necessary to the elucidation of the principles involved. They may be said to form part and parcel of an integral structure every stone of which has been laid with the utmost care and precision. The principles which may be said to underlie the Resolution are these :—

We desire that a fair proportion of the members of the reconstituted Councils should be elected. We have not the remotest idea that the Government should vacate its position in favour of our worthy president and his following. We do not desire that our rulers "should mount guard, while we handled the moneys." Yesterday we passed a resolution in favour of our mounting guard, if the Government would let us do so, by enrolling us as volunteers. It is not indeed a question of the abdication of the Government. It is much more a question of the association of the people, in a partial and modified form, in the Government of the country.

Having decided that a proportion of the members should be elected, the next question we have to consider is—how are they to be elected—what are to be the constituencies? We say the members are to be elected by local bodies, Chambers of Commerce, Trades' Associations, Universities and other similiar bodies of established repute. I can, however, conceive of a possible objection to this scheme, and I am anxious to meet this objection before I proceed further. It may be said that our local bodies are untried and that the elective Municipalities were created only the other day. But the Municipalities in Bengal, in one form or other, have now been in existence and have had a trial for nearly a quarter of a century; and the District Boards of to-day are the Road Cess Committees which were established about the year 1871. This objection must, therefore, fall to the ground. But admitting that the local bodies are untried, admitting the force of the

objection which has been raised, we reply that we pin our faith upon no particular system, no creed, no dogma. Representation is our motto, our watchword, our battle-cry, the gospel of our political redemption. We give the Government a *carte-blanche*. We tell them that if our programme does not please them, let them devise any system of their own—let it be a system of direct representation or any other form or system which may please them best. But we say at the same time—mark the moderation of our views—that whatever may be your scheme of representative government, the interests of all classes of the community, Hindus, Mahomedans, Parsees, Sikhs, Eurasians, of all races and of all creeds—should be adequately cared for. We desire to exclude none. All are alike welcome to the holiest of holies—the temple of representative government. We do not desire that the majority should swamp the minority, or that any particular class should have any preponderance, except such as may belong to superior devotion, courage and self-sacrifice. These are the qualities which have governed humanity in the past and they will continue to govern the representative institution of New India.

Such being the constitution of our Councils the next question which we have to consider is—what are to be their powers and functions? These powers are to be of a limited character. They are not such as will displace or supersede the authority of the Executive Government; on the contrary, their exercise will be a source of material help to the Government. In the first place, the Councils should have the right of interpellation; secondly, they should be vested with some power of control over the finances. The right of interpellation would be an advantage to the Government as it would be an advantage to the people. It is a constant complaint we hear repeated on all sides that there are frequent misinterpretations and misconceptions of the motives and objects of the Government in the Public Press. Now if this is so, explanations with regard to the policy and the conduct of the Government made by

official members from their place in Council and upon their personal responsibility would be received with implicit confidence and go far to remove the misconceptions which under existing circumstances, the Government no doubt must occasionally suffer from. From this point of view the right of interpellation would be an immense gain to the Government. It would likewise be the safeguard of popular liberty. It is a right which if carefully exercised will enable the popular representatives to bring many an erratic Magistrate to book. In the worst days of imperial rule in France, Louis Napoleon deprived the Legislative Chamber of this important right, lest it should be a source of embarrassment to his Government.

With reference to the control over finance which we suggest that the Councils should be invested with, the present rule is that the Budget must be laid before the Supreme Council only when new taxes have to be levied. We advocate a further extension, and upon the same lines, of this concession which has already been made. We propose that whether the Budget concern the Province or the Empire, whether a new tax has to be levied or not, in all cases and under all circumstances, the Budget should be laid before the Council—Provincial or Imperial—that those who pay the taxes may have some voice in the expenditure.

Such is to be the constitution of the Councils—such are to be the powers with which they should be vested. But are the Councils to be left in the unfettered exercise of these powers? Is the Government to abdicate all power in favour of the President and his followers? Not at all. Mark how moderate our demands are. We propose that the Government should have the right of vetoing the decisions of the Council. If any measure passed by the Council seems inconsistent with the public interests, the Government may disallow it, stating of course its reason within a reasonable limit of time, the power of appeal in such cases being vested in a standing committee of the House of Commons. Some may say—why introduce

this question—why talk about this right of veto at all? I think it would be wise on our part to do so. You may depend upon it that the Government will reserve to itself some power of of control over bodies which are thus reconstituted and invested with these new powers. You are familiar with the sections relating to control in your Local Self-Government Acts, and you may be sure that when the experiment of Self-Government is carried to a higher stage, a small power will be reserved by the Government. Such being the case, it seems to me that it would be as wise as it would be moderate to suggest from our point of view what the nature of the control should be.

Such are the principles which underlie the scheme which has been tentatively suggested. But whether this or any other scheme is adopted, I trust we will continue to press upon the Government in season and out of season that the time has come when alike in the interests of the people and for the honour of English rule, the representative element should be recognised in the Government of the country. I have a profound faith in the ultimate success of our cause. Faith can remove mountains were the memorable words uttered eighteen hundred years ago by the illustrious founder of Christianity. If we are true to ourselves, and if we have faith and patience, the victory will assuredly be ours. I have abundant confidence in the justice and generosity of the English people. Britain, the august mother of free nations, cannot refuse to us a boon which is in such entire accord with her own traditions and the instincts of her great people. But I have yet an appeal to make to the assembled representatives of all India. We should begin the agitation at once. The struggle must now commence. We are on the threshold of a new age. We are witnessing a new birth. The darkness of midnight has disappeared; and the faint grey streaks of dawn are distinctly visible in the distant horizon. Grave and solemn are our responsibilities; and I hope and trust that the voice which has been raised in this hall will be re-echoed in every town, in every district, and in every province,

and will be wafted across seas and mountains and deserts to the foot-steps of that throne, from whose beneficence and justice and liberality we anticipate the fulfilment of our hopes and the redemption of our people.

THE QUEEN'S JUBILEE.

A very enthusiastic and influential representative meeting of the inhabitants of Calcutta was held at the Town Hall on Wednesday, the 29th January 1887 to consider the best means for the best way of commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of Her Gracious Majesty's most beneficent reign. The meeting was attended by all sections of the community representing the rank and wealth, culture and intelligence of the community, and among the speakers there were such men as H. H. the Nawab Bahadur of Moorshedabad, H. H. the Maharaja of Cuch Behar, Raja Rajendra Lala Mittra, L.L.D., Maharaja Sir Jotindra Mohun Tagore, K.C.S.I., Sir W. W. Hunter, K.C.S.I., L.L.D., Sir H. L. Harrison, K.C.S.I., Nawab Abdul Lateef Khan Bahadur, C.I.E., Raja Rajendra Narain Deb, the Hon'ble Mr. Amir Ali and others. The Hon'ble Sir Rivers Thompson, the then Lieutenant-Governor, was in the Chair. Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee in supporting the fourth Resolution spoke as follows :—

YOUR HONOUR AND GENTLEMEN,

I do indeed deem it a great privilege to be allowed to take a part in the proceedings of this meeting. I belong to that party in Indian politics (and I make no secret of my faith) which has been indentified with the political agitations of the

last few years; and we want to make it clear on this auspicious occasion of the Jubilee—we want to proclaim from one part of the country to the other in terms that shall not be mistaken—that to whatever party we may belong—whether Liberals or Conservatives in Indian politics—whatever creed we may profess—whatever nationality may claim us as its own—whether we are Hindus, Mussulmans, Christians, Parsees or Sikhs, we are all united by one common, all-pervading sentiment of gratitude to that throne, from whose beneficence we enjoy the choicest of earthly blessings, and from whose justice and liberality, we anticipate the fruition of those hopes which represent the hopes of civilization and humanity. Deep in our gratitude, unswerving in our loyalty, to the Hindoo mind the throne is the embodiment of the highest virtues. In the words of the greatest of our epic poets, "the King is the truth of the truth-teller, the virtue of the virtuous, the dignity of the dignified, the lord, master, protector of the needy, the indigent and the helpless." In honouring the Sovereign, in adoring his personality, we but render homage to those princely qualities which his office represents. There is no name in ancient Indian history which excites such love or such pious reverence as that of Rama, the lord of Ajudhya; and Rama stands forth before the Indian world as the incarnation of the noblest kingly virtues. The brave in war, the generous in peace, the sagacious in council, the obedient son, the devoted husband, the affectionate brother, the name of this warrior-King strikes the tenderest chord in the heart of every true-born Hindoo. Our loyalty thus based upon the possession of the moral virtues transcends considerations of race and religion, and we freely offered our homage to the greatest of the Mohamedan Princes, to the illustrious Akber and his illustrious descendants, and our poets sang:—*Delhiswarava Jagadiswarava*, the lord of Delhi is the lord of the Universe. Such are our traditions of loyalty. And is it possible for us to withhold the tribute of our homage and the tribute of our

loyalty to the Queen of England, our august and beloved Sovereign, whose domestic virtues have ennobled the throne itself, the purity of whose character is an example to the womanhood of mankind, whose deep concern in the welfare of her Indian subjects has awakened in our hearts a sense of attachment for her person and her throne, but who above all stands forth as the representative of a civilization which had its home in the East, which has reached its highest development in the West, and which is destined in the fullness of time to revivify into life the dead bones of our own ancient civilization and thus to establish the surest and the most durable bonds of connection and sympathy between the East and the West, by the ties of a common and renovated civilization? What a glorious work England has done in India! What a memorable record hers has been in Asiatic history! Rome accomplished her imperial mission, when under the aegis of her protection, the Christian religion was established throughout the extent of her broad dominions, and the triumph of Christian principles was assured. But to England was reserved a glory, far more memorable than ever fell to the lot of Greek or Roman to achieve. The magnitude of her work is not to be judged of by the magnitude of those works of public utility with which she has covered the country. Roads have been opened; rivers have been spanned; railways and telegraphs intersect the land; time and distance have been abridged; and the marvels of Western science have been applied to the development of the inexhaustible resources of our country. But these achievements, memorable as they are, pale before the more solid splendour of that intellectual and moral triumph which England has won in the East. What an awakening there has been, intellectual and moral! What an upheaval of the national mind—what an uplifting of the national soul—what an elevation all along the line! What joy, what faith, what hope have been kindled in our hearts! What visions of glory conjure themselves up before the mind as we contemplate the grand

prospect that is opening out before us! All this is due to English education, to English influences, to the increasing contact between the East and the West. English education has communicated the Promethean spark to the dormant forms of our national life; it has revolutionised our ideas. Native Indian society is sensibly affected by the impact of Western thought; and we are on the threshold of a new birth. Two years before the accession of Her Majesty, the Government of India had recognised the duty of the State to encourage high English education. This was done by a Resolution dated the 7th of March 1835, and a few months later, on the 15th of September 1835, the Press was liberated by Sir Charles Metcalfe. Thus then the two great agencies which have so powerfully contributed to create the social forces in the midst of which we live were already in full operation before the accession of Her Majesty; but it was under the auspices of her glorious reign that they reached their highest development. The Education Department was organized: the grant-in-aid system was introduced; and last not least the Indian Universities were established. Native Indian journalism started into life under auspices of the Serampur Missionaries; and aided by the deepening culture of the community the Native Press has developed itself into a mighty power and a potent instrument for the diffusion of knowledge. And lastly we recall to mind with gratitude that the Proclamation of the 1st of November 1858 was issued in the reign of the Queen and bore her sign-manual. We regard the Proclamation as the great Charter of our rights, and I trust the day is not distant when the principles which it embodies will form the cornerstone of Indian administration. Such are the titles of our Queen to our loyalty, our love and our gratitude. You have already resolved to celebrate the Jubilee by those demonstrations which so powerfully appeal to the popular fancies. Our Queen is the Queen of the people, and it is as well that the demonstrations in honour of the Jubilee should in part be of a popular character. But in our minds,

in the minds of this generation and in the imperishable pages of history, the Queen stands forth as the Sovereign under the auspices of whose glorious reign, some of the most memorable achievements of modern civilization have been won. It is therefore only meet and proper that a permanent memorial should commemorate the Jubilee of such a reign. What the form of the memorial is to be, must rest with the Committee. I have no desire to anticipate their decision. But there is something which is nearest to my heart, something which is uppermost in my mind, to which reference has already been made and in support of which I would venture once again to plead. It seems to me that the most fitting memorial of the Jubilee would be the establishment of a Technical College which by reviving our decayed industries would help forward the material advancement of the country and bring bread to the doors of our starving population. Such an institution would be in exact accordance with the spirit of this celebration. The temple of the arts is the temple of peace and plenty, and the reign of our Sovereign has been a reign of unexampled happiness and prosperity to her people. The Institute will extend its blessings to succeeding generations and will remind them of the good and virtuous Queen who had ruled over them, and the memorials of whose reign were the memorials of beneficence. But whatever may be the ultimate form of the memorial which the Committee may decide upon, of this I am assured that the loyal enthusiasm of a grateful people will make it a success, and that on this auspicious occasion of the Jubilee, there will rise from the hearts of a grateful, contented and prosperous people, the one universal hope and the one universal prayer that long may the Queen be spared to reign over her vast and extensive dominions and to draw closer together the hearts of her people, so that they may realize such as they had never before realized that they are the subjects of the same Sovereign, the participators of the same rights and privileges, linked together by a

common destiny, and having a common part to enact in history, and which is best enacted by the cultivation of those mutual charities and by the practice of that high-souled beneficence, of which the life of the Sovereign affords the best example and the most striking illustration. The unity of the Empire will be most forcibly illustrated on the occasion the approaching Jubilee. Let it also mean a unity of hearts, feelings and sympathies, the establishment of brotherly harmony and concord between the different races that inhabit this great Empire, and then the Jubilee will have raised its own monument, the most memorable, the most enduring and the most acceptable to the Sovereign herself.

THE THIRD NATIONAL CONGRESS.

At the Third National Congress held at Madras (27th—30th December 1887), Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee in moving the Resolution regarding the expansion of the Legislative Councils spoke as follows :—

GENTLEMEN AND BROTHER-DELEGATES,

I thank you for the cordial greeting which you have thus accorded to me, and I shall endeavour, to the best of my ability to discharge the very onerous and responsible duty, which the proposer of this resolution has to perform. I will not repeat the words of the resolution as they have already been read out to you by our distinguished chairman. But before I proceed to make any remarks upon this resolution, you will permit me, on my own behalf and on behalf of my brother-delegates of Bengal (applause) and, I may claim also, on behalf of my countrymen of Bengal in general, whose sympathies—whose watchful sympathies, I may add—will follow us through every part of these proceedings, to tender

our obeisance, and the tribute of our heartfelt homage, to this great and representative national gathering (applause). Gentlemen, the dream of ages is about to be realized. The differences of generations are about to be forgotten (hear, hear) and a noble prospect is opening out to view, a prospect, fraught with brilliance, with beauty, and untold happiness to the people. I will not dare to anticipate the future, nor will I indulge in the ecstasies of prophetic vision; but this I undertake to say, that whatever may be the future of this Congress, and with it, of the country, we are on the right track—that track of light—leading to the destined goal (loud and continued applause), marked by the consolidation of British rule and the emancipation of our people (applause). Gentlemen, in this connection it would ill become me not to refer for a moment to the magnificent hospitality, which we are receiving at present from our countrymen of Madras—Madras miscalled benighted—but a source of living light to the sister Presidencies of India (hear, hear). May this spirit of union and sympathy, of which this Congress is the highest expression and the noblest embodiment, grow and deepen to the eternal honour of English rule and to the manifold advantage of the people of India (applause).

Gentlemen, we attach the utmost importance to this question of the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils. We accord to it the foremost place amongst the topics of discussion. We unfurl the banner of the Congress and upon it are written in characters of glittering gold, which none may efface, the great words of this resolution—"Representative Institutions for India" (applause).

Are we guided by mere sentimental considerations in making this act of deliberate choice? Ah! No! There are the strongest reasons why the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils should be placed in the fore-front of topics to be discussed by the National Congress. It is impossible to think of a domestic grievance or a matter of domestic complaint

which will not be remedied, if the constitution of the Councils were changed and modelled according to our programme. Talk of the separation of judicial from executive functions, why the reform would be effected at once if we had a potential voice in the making of our laws. Talk of the wider employment of our countrymen in the public service, why the Queen's Proclamation would be vindicated to the letter (applause) if we had a control in the management of our domestic concerns (applause). You fret and foam under the rigors of an income-tax which touches even the necessaries of subsistence, why the incidence of the tax would be altered, the minimum raised, if we had anything to do with the imposition of the tax or if we were permitted to modify it (applause). I might multiply instances but that it is not necessary. The reconstitution of the Legislative Councils would be the panacea to the countless complaints relating to the internal administration of the country. Gentlemen, by this resolution we re-affirm the necessity for the expansion and reform of the Councils according to the programme laid down by the Congress of 1885 and 1886. We lay down the principles, but further elaboration would be unwise. It would be presenting a broader flank to the attack of our opponents. They would attack us in points of detail and the great cardinal principles of the scheme would be lost sight of, in this discussion. Therefore it has been wisely resolved that there should not be any further elaboration of details. We have suggested the principles; we have made it abundantly clear that we have thought—earnestly thought—on the subject; but we are not the legislators of the country, though we hope to be so some day (hear, hear) when the Councils are reconstituted. The Government has highly-paid officials drawing ten thousand Rupees a month (laughter) and it is for them to elaborate the Bill and settle the details, upon principles which may find acceptance with the Government. But gentlemen succinct as our scheme was, it did not escape criticism. Criticism we

do not wish to avoid. Ah! no! The National Congress walks by the broad light of publicity. We court and solicit criticism; but it must be honest criticism (hear, hear and applause). What then are we to think of a critic who forgetting what is due to his official position and the reserve which such position implies, tells the public upon a memorable occasion that this Congress is a sham Congress (voices of "shame, shame") that it is a Hindu Congress (cries of "no no,") and that it is a Congress of nobodies (voices of "no, no,")? Sham Congress! In the midst of this illustrious array of delegates and of this stupendous spectacle of self-sacrifice which the delegates have displayed in coming from their distant homes to attend the Congress. If ever there was the test of sincerity it lay in self-sacrifice. Tell me the measure of your self-sacrifice and I will tell you what is the measure of your patriotism. But we are told this Congress is a Hindu Congress, presided over forsooth by an illustrious Mahomedan gentleman (applause and laughter). But it is also a Congress of nonentities. where there is Sir Raja Madhava Rao (laughter and applause) and where last year such men as Sir Maharaja Jotendro Mohun Tagore and Dr. Rajendra Lal and others took a prominent part in the proceedings! But, gentlemen, we will leave our official critic to reflect upon his own performance in the solitude of his official dignity. Let us pass on to another gentleman who has been criticising the Congress—not so much the Congress as the scheme of representative government propounded by that body. I suppose we expect our critics to read what we have been saying or what we have been writing. Gentlemen, I am a journalist and I know that we sometimes depart from this principle (laughter) and criticise books without reading them (laughter) and possibly our friend who hails from Allyghur (A voice "beneath notice"). Yes, *he* is beneath notice, but one or two of his observations have to be noticed. Our friend who hails from Allyghur possibly acted on the principle of the journalist and he was good enough to tell the

public in a letter which extended over 12 columns of a leading journal that what we wanted was an oligarchy of educated natives, but that it was an impossibility to place the army under the control of this oligarchy. Now this was precisely what we did not want (loud laughter). We neither wanted an oligarchy or any other "Archy." The dreams of an oligarchy never entered into our remotest conceptions. As for the army, we specially excluded it from all control on the part of our reconstituted Legislative Councils. It was not even covered by the right of interpellation. Gentlemen, such have been the criticisms which have been made with regard to the scheme. It is not from such critics that we can derive any light or leading; but it strikes me that the more we examine the scheme, the more we examine the principles underlying it, the deeper becomes the conviction that it is marked by a remarkable degree of moderation, and I am prepared to prove by reference to the existing state of things, by reference to the recorded views of the Government and by reference to legislative enactments, that our scheme judged by them is moderation itself (applause). The Legislative Councils were constituted under the India Councils Act of 1861. Let me read to you the 45th Section of the Act which applies to the Provincial Legislative Councils; "Whenever such proclamation as aforesaid shall have been issued regarding the said Division or territories respectively, the Lieutenant-Governor thereof shall nominate, for his assistance in making laws and regulations, such number of councillors as shall be in such Proclamation specified; provided that not less than one-third of such councillors, shall in every case, be non-official persons."

Now what do we want? What is our programme? We want that instead of one-third, at least one-half of the Council should consist of non-official members, and that we should have the right of electing that half. The Government itself makes the concession that at least one-third of the members should be non-officials. After twenty years of trial and experience,

we want the Government to move a step further and raise the third to a half. I do not think that we are making a very extravagant demand. On our side of the country (I am not prepared to speak of Bombay and Madras) the Municipal laws are revised every ten years. I hope it is the case here also. I am not competent to speak, nor do I hear any response from the Bombay or Madras delegates. If the Municipal laws are revised once in every ten years, why should not the laws relating to the constitution of the Councils be revised at least say once in every twenty years? In 1861 these laws were passed and now more than a quarter of a century have elapsed and great changes have taken place; therefore I think that upon the very foundations the Government have laid for us, we have a very strong case to urge.

But this is not all. The second point which we insist upon is that the right of interpellation should be accorded to the Legislative Councils. Well, gentlemen, will it be believed that this right was actually enjoyed by the members of the Supreme Legislative Council at one time, but that some lawyers made the Council too hot for the officials—they would drive a coach and four through the restrictions imposed upon the right, and the privilege was subsequently withdrawn? The first meeting of the Legislative Council of India was held on the 20th May 1854, during the reign of Lord Dalhousie who was not only vigorous in his foreign policy but was an ardent reformer in regard to domestic affairs; and let me read from the standing order of the first meeting. The order is as follows:—"A member may ask a question of another member, but such questions must be confined to matters immediately connected with the business of the Legislative Council and must be asked in a manner which does not involve argument or inference."

Thus you see that the right of interpellation existed in regard to the items of business then pending before the Council. All that we now tell the Government is; "Go a step

further and give us the right of interpellation, but do not confine it merely to matters pending before the Council but rather extend it to all matters of domestic concern." I think that is a reasonable request to make and especially bearing in mind the great and rapid advance which the country has made within the last 20 years. Well, gentlemen, there is a third prayer in connection with the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils and that is that the Budget should be discussed by the Councils (hear, hear). Now, how does this matter stand at present? I suppose you are aware that the Budgets are discussed by the Supreme Legislative Council but only when any fresh measure of taxation is proposed; otherwise the Budget is—shall I use the word—burked; it is not laid before the Council at all. Well now it so happens curiously enough, for truth must triumph and it receives unexpected support from unexpected quarters, that the Chambers of Commerce of all the Presidencies have addressed a memorial to the Government asking that the Parliamentary statute might be revised so as to permit the discussion of the Budget by the Supreme Legislative Council in all cases whether it is proposed to levy a new tax or not (hear, hear). In this matter the Chambers of Commerce, the National Congress and all India, with its multitudinous races, creeds and sects are unanimously agreed and the fact again points to the moderation of our demands. Thus then, gentlemen, you will see that whether in regard to the addition of non-official members or to the right of interpellation or to the discussion of the Budget by the Legislative Council, we ask Government to proceed upon lines which the Government has either partially adopted or which meet with the unanimous support of public opinion. Gentlemen, it is with satisfaction we find that our demands being so moderate, the question has come within the range of practical politics. It is no longer a dream, an Utopia, or the phantom of an excited imagination. In February 1885, Mr. Macaulay, Secretary to the Bengal Government, thus wrote or rather spoke, though all their

speeches are really written before-hand (laughter);—"We require critics and destroyers as well as authors and constructors. From this point of view, I, for one, entirely agree with those who consider that our Council should be enlarged. It seems to me of the utmost importance that all views, all rights, all parties should be properly represented, in order that the broad light of practical knowledge and experience, as well as the keener gleam of special interests, and it may even be of special prejudices, may be freely let in upon our deliberations."

This was what Mr. Macaulay said in February 1885. But one greater than Mr. Macaulay, greater than all Indian civilians—His Excellency the Viceroy himself—has, upon a memorable occasion, expressed his warmest sympathy with our aspirations in this respect. This was what the Viceroy said in his speech on the Jubilee occasion;—"Glad and happy should I be if during my sojourn among them (the people of India) circumstances permitted me to extend and to place upon a wider and more logical footing the political status which was so wisely given a generation ago, by that great statesman Lord Halifax, to such Indian gentlemen as by their influence, their acquirements and the confidence they inspired in their fellow-countrymen, were marked out as useful adjuncts to our Legislative Council." Thus we are within measurable distance of victory. We are in view of the "promised land" so to speak. If we are true to ourselves and if we go on affirming, re-affirming, and re-affirming again and again, the resolution of to-day, God willing, it will soon be an accomplished reality (applause). I have heard with feelings, I may say, of concern, the disappointment which has sometimes been expressed with regard to the work of the National Congress. It has been said, of course, by our opponents, that the labours of the National Congress have not yet been attended with any definite and marked results. But the Congress is an infant institution of only 2 or 3 years' growth. What are 2 or 3 or even 50 years in the life-time of a nation? We must go on

working and agitating. The goddess of Liberty is a jealous god and she is exacting in her worship from her votaries. We should worship her with assiduity, sincere, sustained and devoted, and then only can we expect to receive her smiles. It would not do to take part in this great national assembly on this particular occasion and then to go to sleep for the rest of the year. We must be steady and continuous in our work, and I am quite sure that when the whole country has with one voice expressed itself with reference to this question, England, the august mother of free nations, will not refuse to grant us a boon which is in such entire accord with her own traditions and which will establish her empire broad-based upon the affections of her people (Applause). To England we may appeal with confidence. When Italy was struggling for liberty, England stretched forward the right hand of sympathy. When Greece was endeavouring to assert her place amongst the nationalities of the earth, England was there, the foster-mother of freedom, responsive to the call. We are neither Italians nor Greeks. We are something better. We are British subjects (hear, hear and applause). England has taken us into her bosom and claims us as her own. We appeal to her by the sweetest, the gentlest, the tenderest and yet withal the most durable of all ties, that which binds the mother to her offspring, to confer upon us the inestimable boon of representative institutions, and I am sure we do not appeal in vain. Let us go on, praying, asking, agitating, resting our hopes of success upon Divine Providence, and victory will assuredly crown our efforts (Loud and continued cheering).

THE ARMS ACT.

At the Madras National Congress after the Resolution regarding the Arms Act was put before the meeting, an amendment was moved against it and Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea in opposing the amendment spoke as follows:—

GENTLEMEN AND BROTHER-DELEGATES,

I come upon the platform as one of my friend Mr. Chandavarkar's schoolboys (laughter), I come here with the object of strongly protesting against the amendment, and supporting the original proposition and adding a small rider to it which, I trust, will be generally accepted, by this great assembly of my countrymen (hear, hear and applause). Gentlemen, the Arms' Act casts an unmerited slur upon the loyalty of my countrymen (hear, hear and a voice of 'no'). It does, sir. (Voices of 'it does'). To the Englishmen, to Eurasians and to others we are quite willing to extend the right hand of friendship, and we are quite willing to accept from them the substantial tokens of their sympathy, which have added lustre and strength to this Congress movement. The European, the Eurasian, the American, the West-Indian, the Negro, all races, all creeds, and all nationalities may bear arms without any restriction of any kind but not the loyal Indian subjects of our Queen-Empress (hear, hear, and loud and continued applause). They, and they alone must obtain a license from the constituted authorities before they are in a position even to carry a dagger or a poniard. Gentlemen, is this a position consistent with self-respect? Is this a position which we can contemplate with complaisance? I have been told that we should be practical. Ah! Yes. We ought to be practical politicians,

and the greatest of practical politicians, is Mr. Gladstone (Applause). What did he say in his Midlothian speech about the Arms' Act? I am not prepared with the quotation, but I know he thought that it was a disgrace to the statute book that such an Act should be made a part of the law of the land (Applause). Then, sir, we have passed Resolution relating to the re-imposition of the import duties. Does any one of its most ardent supporters, dream for a moment that the Resolution will be given effect to immediately, and at once (hear, hear, and a voice of 'may be')? It may be, and so also this may be given effect to (Applause and a voice 'at any rate, it is a dream'). At any rate, it is a dream, but the dreams of one age become the pregnant realities of the next. Who would have dreamt, 20 years ago, that the question of representative Government would have come within the range of practical politics in this country? Who would have dreamt 20 years ago that the *élite* of our community should have been honored with seats in the highest courts in the land? (Applause). Who would have dreamt, 10 years ago, that a native of India would be made the Chief Justice of Bengal? (Applause). These are dreams, utopian to the unthinking, and to the unimaginative (hear, hear, and applause) but not to those who, with the instinct of the prophet, see deep into the things of the future, and exulting in what they feel must come, carry on their patriotic work, and endow with life and reality the dreams which they dream and the visions which they see in their moments of prophetic inspiration. Yes, it may be a dream, but it is none the less a duty to cling to and strive to make it a reality. We should go on protesting and protesting against this Act, until we have got rid of it from the statute book, and I think that this Congress will have been wanting in its duty if it does not, by an overwhelming majority, throw out the amendment which has been proposed (hear, hear). I am also surprised at the logical inconsequence of that amendment. These gentlemen, who support the amendment,

—and I desire to speak of them with the utmost possible respect—these gentlemen, I say, seize hold of our premises and quietly depart from our conclusions (Voices of 'shame, shame.') '*That in view of the unmerited slur which it cast ....local boards are to certify, and the magistrates are to give passes.*" Does that remove the unmerited slur? (*'Yes, yes;* ' '*no, no*'). It does not do so, unless, as Mr. Khare contends, we are to include Europeans in that amendment. We know perfectly well that Europeans will never be included. I protest against the proposal to degrade them. I protest against the humiliation which is proposed to be cast upon them. If we cannot rise to their heights, are they to be pulled down to our depths? Against that policy, and against that principle, let this Congress raise its voice of protest (Hear, hear and applause). Therefore, gentlemen, you will see at once that accepting the premises, this conclusion set forth in the amendment, cannot follow at all, and that neither the slur, nor the hardship which is set forth in those premises can be removed, if we accept the conclusion. For how, pray, to turn now to these, are the hardships to be removed? Local Boards and Municipalities will certify. There has been some little straining of legal technicalities here; and though I am not a lawyer, I am guided by my common sense and I say that Municipality means the Chairman of the Municipality, Local Board means the Chairman of the local board. Now, pray, who are the chairmen? Why just these magistrates and sub-divisional magistrates in whom are now vested the power of granting or refusing passes. I think it is flying from the frying-pan into the fire, only the agony is both intensified and prolonged. Instead of one appeal to the magistrate you will have to appeal to him twice—first, as chairman of the board; second, as the head of the district or the sub-division. Now, gentlemen, let me put these questions. Upon what ground of common sense, upon what ground of logic, upon what ground of sentiment, are we to accept the amendment? I say, with

all the earnestness I can command, that it would be really unworthy of this national gathering if it did not, from year to year, protest, in the most emphatic terms, against an enactment which disgraces the statute book, and which involves a national humiliation and which is inconsistent with the Queen's proclamation. I trust, therefore, that with one voice, you will reject the amendment. You may like to know what remedy I suggest. The remedy is this, that the Act of 1857 should be substituted in place of the present Act. Mark you, this Act was passed at the time of the Mutiny, when the fate of the Empire was trembling in the balance. We surely do not want a more stringent Act when peace and benevolence shine brightly over the land. Lord Canning's terms are substantially just. Suppose, there are budmashes; and suppose there was an outbreak in a district, to those budmashes and to that district the Act was applied, and to none other. So far as that one district even was concerned, good and true men were allowed to be supplied with arms. That legislation is singularly short-sighted which punishes good men for the faults of bad men, millions for the misdeeds of hundreds. Upon the highest grounds of common sense, upon the highest grounds of statesmanship, upon the highest grounds of patriotism, I appeal to this great Congress to reject the amendment and support the motion that I have laid before you, *viz.*, that the original proposition be retained, with the addition of the words, "and Lord Canning's Arms' Act be re-enacted in place thereof." (Loud and tumultuous applause).

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

A public meeting of the rate-payers of Calcutta and its suburbs was held at the Town Hall on Friday the 14th April 1888, to protest against the passing of the Calcutta Municipal Bill. The Hon'ble Prince Furrock Shah moved and Kumar Debender Mullick seconded the following Resolution :—

That this meeting desires to place on record the sense of its great regret at the disregard of public opinion which has hitherto marked the progress of the Calcutta Municipal Bill through the Bengal Legislative Council, and earnestly prays that His Honour the President in Council will be pleased to allow the reconsideration of the sections already passed by the Council.

Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea in supporting the above Resolution spoke as follows :—

GENTLEMEN,

I have great pleasure in supporting the Resolution which stands in my name. I rejoice that so many of the rate-payers of Calcutta have met together to consider the provisions of a Bill which so intimately affects their happiness and the well-being of their great city. It has been truly remarked by the most illustrious of living statesman—the patriarch who at the age of eighty is fighting as the crowning act of his life the great battle of Irish freedom—it has been remarked by Mr. Gladstone that municipal institutions are the seed-plots upon which and around which are developed that political capacity and those habits of political thought which constitute the most enduring heritage of a nation. It is upon the foundations of our municipal institutions that the superstructure of our political liberty must rise. Talk of representative institutions—of the re-constitution of our Legislative Councils—they must proceed

upon the basis of Local Self-Government. Secure your municipal institutions, ensure the freedom of your civic corporations, and representative institutions will follow as surely as the night follows the day. In England the history of municipal institutions carries the mind back to those troublous times when the foundations of English liberty were being laid, consecrated by the blood of the martyrs of English history. We can claim no such prescription in favour of our municipalities. With us they are of yesterday's growth. We owe them to the beneficence of our rulers. But they have already struck deep root in our hearts; for they recall to mind the memory of those village organizations and of that wonderful structure of the Punchayet system which in India are as old as the hills and are graven on the deepest instincts of our race. I am glad that we have met here to protect the municipal interests of the first city in India, and if our labours are even partially successful, this meeting will not have been held in vain.

From the very first inception of the amalgamation scheme, I have opposed it. I opposed it at the municipal meeting; I have opposed it as a journalist, and I now join my voice with yours protesting against a measure which is distinctly retrograde in its character, and which does not even offer the semblance of a concession to the rising aspirations of the people. It seems to me to be a bitter mockery of fate that while our Congresses from year's end to year's end should be thundering forth their demands and pressing for the extension of the principle of Self-Government, this retrograde Bill should be introduced into the Legislative Council of the *premier* province in the Empire and should be making its triumphant way through Council in spite of our protests. Painful as the situation is, it becomes doubly painful when we reflect upon what has just taken place in connection with a similar measure in the sister Presidency of Bombay. The Bombay Municipal Bill has just been passed by the Bombay Council. What was

the feeling with which the Bill was received by the representatives of the native and the non-official European community? The Bill as originally framed was open to serious objection. But it had so far been modified in deference to public opinion that both Messrs. Telang and Mehta expressed their approval of the measure in the form in which it was passed. Now I ask—is it possible for the most thorough-going advocate of the measures of Government to sing the pæans of praise in favour of the Bill which we are now considering? I should think not. Now what is our complaint? Why is it that we have met here to protest against this Bill? Is it a trivial circumstance that has brought together on this historic platform the representatives of the intelligence, the culture and the wealth of this great city? No! We have a serious grievance—a sore ground of complaint. What we complain of is this—that after more than ten years of what on the whole must be pronounced to have been a successful experiment of the elective principle in the government of Calcutta, we find that not only has no concession been made to the people but that a Bill has been introduced which is distinctly retrograde and re-actionary in its character. Is it possible to doubt that the elective system has on the whole been a success in the government of Calcutta? I appeal to no less an authority than that of His Excellency the Viceroy. In reply to an address presented to His Excellency at Lucknow by the Talukdars of Oudh, Lord Dufferin was pleased to say that the general consensus of opinion was in favour of the view, that the elective system had on the whole been successful in the more important centres of population. But any one reading through this Bill and unacquainted with the municipal literature of Calcutta for the last twelve years would come to the conclusion that Local Self-Government was a failure in our city, and that therefore it had become necessary to place the Municipality in a position of greater subordination than before in relation to the Government. I am not talking at random. I am prepared to quote

chapter and verse. Here is a crucial test. Compare the provisions relating to control as they are to be found in the existing law with those now reserved to Government by the new Bill. Under the existing law, the Government can interfere with the Municipality in case of default made by that body in respect of two specific matters—the cleaning and the conservancy of the Town; and then only after a formal enquiry held by a regularly constituted Commission, in which the Corporation have a right to be represented by a member nominated by them. Now under the present Bill, all these safe-guards are dispensed with, and the jurisdiction of the Government is extended to default of every kind, of every form and shape—to general default in short, though of course it should be of a serious nature. And further the Government need not hold any enquiry at all, but by a simple order, a simple Resolution published in the official Gazette seal the independence of the Corporation and direct it to undertake extensive works to be paid for out of Municipal funds. Now I ask what necessity was there for the taking of these fresh powers? Was not the law tried in 1884, when a Commission was appointed under it, and was it not found amply sufficient for all purposes? Was there ever the smallest breath of complaint uttered in connection with it—that its provisions were inadequate or that the procedure prescribed by it was too cumbrous, or that the recommendations had to be made under conditions which stood in the way of their being carried out? No such complaint had ever been made, and yet this unheard-of innovation is introduced into the Bill. Now what becomes of the independence of the Corporation with such a law as this? Whatever independence it will now enjoy will be due to the sufferance of the Government rather than to rights secured by its own constitution. For my own part I have abundant confidence in the Government of Sir Steuart Bayley. Of this I am quite sure that the present respected Head of the Government, the enlightened friend of Local Self-Government,

will not needlessly interfere with the functions and prerogatives of this or any other Corporation. But this is really not a question of confidence or no confidence. It is a matter of principle. The question we have to ask is—whether such vast and undefined powers claimed on behalf of the Government over the Corporation are consistent with its independence and its efficiency? I know what answer will be given. I shall be told in reply that such is the law in England, and if the free burghers of England do not complain, we, at any rate, should hold our tongues. I confess I do not see the force of this argument. There is no analogy whatever between an English and an Indian Municipality in this or any other respect. Every considerable English town is represented by a member in Parliament who protects the interests of the Municipality and safe-guards it against undue interference on the part of the Local Government Board. When we have such an arrangement—when we possess such a privilege—members of our Municipalities sitting in the Legislature armed with the right of interpellation—there will be time enough to talk of engrafting the principles of English law upon the substance of our Municipal legislation. Sir Henry Harrison, the Hon'ble member in charge of the Bill, has a knack of making his indents for his reactionary provisions, now from the English law and now from the Bombay Municipal Act. But he does not borrow a single bright idea from elsewhere. Thus for instance the reactionary sections regarding the constitution of the Town Council and the equally reactionary provisions by which specially-privileged bodies are allowed to send members to the Corporation are all based upon the Bombay Municipal Act. But the Municipal Commissioners of Bombay possess the right of electing their own Chairman. This is too good an idea for Sir Henry Harrison to borrow. Here his imitative faculty halts, and he is careful to allow the present law to remain as it is. Be that as it may, against this dangerous innovation in the law, you will enter your protest in the course

of your proceedings this afternoon. Against this innovation in the law of the land, the Corporation and your public bodies have protested, but all in vain. The Hon'ble Kalinath Mitter, who has been doing yeoman's service in connection with this Bill and to whom you cannot be sufficiently thankful for his labours, moved an amendment expressing your views. But he was outvoted by the solid phalanx of an official majority; and the provision in the Bill has been adopted by the Council in violation of the clearest expression of public opinion. This is my first complaint. But I have some more to make. Take again the provisions relating to the appointment of Chairman. The question came up before the Corporation on two or three occasions, and each time the Corporation voted with singular unanimity in favour of the election of the Chairman by the Commissioners, subject, of course, to confirmation by Government. The Associations gave a similar opinion. The Native Press was unanimous on the subject. But these representations were quietly ignored and the Government will continue to appoint the Chairman as before, without the Commissioners being allowed any voice in the matter. Now mark what the Government of Bengal has just done in this connection in regard to moffasil Municipalities. The administration of moffasil Municipalities by non-official chairman has on the whole been so successful that the Government has issued a circular letter extending the boon to most moffasil Municipalities. Calcutta is not more truly the capital of the Empire than it is the seat of intelligence and public spirit. If moffasil Municipalities are allowed to have a voice in the nomination of their Chairman, *a fortiori* the privilege ought to be conceded to Calcutta. Here again the Hon'ble Kalinath Mitter moved an amendment expressing your views, but he was again out-voted. I must say, I have not been able to follow the arguments which the Hon'ble Mr. Macaulay urged against the amendment of our Hon'ble friend. Mr. Macaulay is no doubt a great friend of Local Self-Govern-

ment, and he was pleased to observe that the Government must continue to appoint the Chairman of the Calcutta Municipality, as the Municipality manages the affairs of a great many people outside Calcutta. But surely they will have their representatives on the Municipal Board either by election or by nomination, who will have a voice in the election of the Chairman. But the argument of Mr. Macaulay implies a complete misconception of the situation. We do not seek to deprive Government of the right of appointing the Chairman. The Government will continue to exercise this right as before. All that is asked for is that the Muncipality may have a voice in the election of the Head of their Executive, as they have a voice in the election of their other officers. No request could be more reasonable, and it is a matter of deep regret that it should not have been complied with, but that in this as in other matters, the clearest dictates of public opinion should have been disregarded. This is my second complaint. But I have yet another to make. There is considerable unanimity of opinion in favour of the further extension of the elective principle upon which the municipal system of Calcutta might be said to rest, by raising the proportion of members elected by the wards from two-thirds to three-fourths of the entire number of Commissioners. Babu Kali Nath Mitter moved an amendment to this effect, but as usual it was negatived. Here again let us note what the Government of Bengal has just done in regard to moffasil Municipalities. His Honor the Lieutenant Governor has issued a circular note calling upon all Commissioners of Divisions to report whether it should not be desirable to allow the Municipalities to elect all their Commissioners, doing away with the system of nomination altogether, except in respect of two specially-qualified officers. His Honor is solicitous of safeguarding the interests of minorities; but with that unerring instinct which is the gift of the true statesman he observes that the minortities are grouped together in homogenous wards, where they can elect their

own men without the risk of being swamped by the superior numbers of the other sections of the community. What is true of the Moffasil is also true of Calcutta. Here we have native wards and European wards. The native wards will return their own men. The European wards can do the same, provided of course they are in earnest about it. The Hon'ble member in charge of the Bill has set himself up as the champion of Mohamedan interests, and in their name has set his face against the expansion of the elective principle in the Government of the town. I yield to none in my regard, my love and my esteem for the Mohamedan community. It is with me a deep and profound conviction which I have never ceased to urge upon the attention of my Hindoo fellow-countrymen that national advancement in its truest, broadest and noblest sense can never be encompassed without the mutual sympathy and complete co-operation between Hindoos and Mohamedans. There is no conflict of interests between Hindoos and Mohamedans in the Corporation and among the constituencies. There is no conflict of interests elsewhere. We are brothers. Let none seek to divide those whom nature has united by the closest of political ties.

In the same way, in spite of the earnest protests of the Press, the Corporation and public bodies, those provisions of the Bill have been passed by the Council which have conferred upon especially-privileged bodies the right of returning members to the Corporation and to the Town Council. Why these bodies should have been singled out in preference to others, it is difficult to understand especially when it is borne in mind that the Hon'ble member in charge of the Bill in a note which he wrote in November in 1886, suggested the inclusion of such Associations, as the Defence Association, the British Indian Association, the Indian Association and the Mahomedan Associations.

Such are some of the fundamental propositions affecting the constitution of the Municipality which have been adopted

by the Council against the clear expression of public opinion. The position of your representatives in Council has been humiliating in the extreme. From week's end to week's end, they have appeared in Council with their cart-loads of amendment which for the most part have been rejected. I can conceive of nothing more humiliating, nothing more illustrative of the impotence of Indian public opinion. Lord Ripon in a speech that he delivered at the Convocation of the Calcutta University had expressed the hope that the day would soon come when even in India public opinion would become the irresistible and the unresisted master of the Government. I fear we are as yet very far off from that blessed consummation—we are not even within measurable distance of the promised land. The discussions of the last few days have brought home to our minds the need for the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils. I do not wish to say a single word reflecting upon any individual or any institution. But a public meeting is the temple of truth, and I must not hesitate to give expression to what I belive to be the truth—I will not hesitate to affirm that our Legislative Councils are so many magnificent shams and our Councillors are so many gilded nonentities. They meet there in these Councils to register the decrees of an omnipotent Executive Government. The Councils should be reconstituted. Such a consummation would be in harmony with the requirements of the age, the traditions of British rule and the genius of the constitution under which it is our privilege to live. All things are tending towards it. Heaven helps those who help themselves. Let the voice of a united nation—of Hindus, Mohamedans, Parsis, Sikhs, Christians—of all races and creeds inhabiting the vast Empire—be heard in appeal before the bar of English public opinion, and the concession will come in its own good time. I have great confidence in the sense of justice and in the generosity of the English people. Wherever floats the flag of England—to whatever part of the world the dominions of the Queen extend,

Self-Government has been established. It cannot be that we alone will continue to be excluded from the cherished heritage of British subjects. The future is ours, such as we choose to make it. Let us so make it that we shall have consolidated the foundations of British rule, secured the political rights of our people, and promoted harmony among all sections of a somewhat heterogeneous community which will spread peace, contentment and happiness throughout the length and breadth of this vast continent.

THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION.

The following address was delivered by Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea at the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Indian Association held at the Albert Hall on Thursday the 26th July 1888. Among those present on the occasion were His Highness the Moharaja of Vizianagram, K. C. S. I., Raja Rajendra Narian Deb Bahadoor and others.

YOUR HIGHNESS AND GENTLEMEN,

I confess I feel myself in a somewhat embarrassing position in being called upon to speak upon the present occasion. This is the third time in the course of the day in which I have been called upon to address a meeting. But I would not plead my physical inability. I have another and a higher reason to urge. It seems to me that as Secretary of this Association it is my duty on such an occasion as this to hold my tongue, to efface my personality and to merge myself in the greatness of the cause which I have the honour to represent. But, while such is my obvious duty I have yet another to mind. The Committee of the Indian Association have laid it as an injunction upon me that I should say something at our annual

meeting and that upon a subject of my own choice. In obedience to their commands I appear here to-night to give expression to some of those thoughts which are uppermost in my mind and in which I hope to have the sympathies of this great meeting. Twelve years ago, on this very day, in this very hall and almost about this hour, the Indian Association was established. The chair which you, Sir, the representative of a great family—the distinguished son of an illustrious sire—so worthily fill, was then occupied by a great scholar who snatching a few moments' respite from his arduous labours in the dark mine of Sanskrit erudition had come here to mark by his personal presence his sympathy with the new-born movement. In the death of Shama Churn Sircar, Bengal has lost a great scholar and an eminent lawyer. There too sat in the body of the hall, the foremost man of his time whom an early death has snatched away from our midst and who, if he had been spared to us, would have led, guided and directed our counsels in these critical times, and would have been a mighty pillar of that gigantic popular movement which is so fraught with promise to the fortunes of our people. In these stirring times we miss the commanding personality, the unrivalled tact, the consummate wisdom and the matchless eloquence of Kristo Dass Pal.

It was under such auspices that the Indian Association was established: and I claim that its traditions all along have been in strict conformity, in perfect harmony with the auspices which gave it birth. It was not indeed without very strong reasons that I have selected our political situation as the subject of my discourse. The present political situation, the forces by which it is marked, the aspirations which form so characteristic a feature of it, the hopes which have been kindled in our bosoms are in part at least the work of the Indian Association. It is admitted on all hands that we are in the midst of a ferment, on the eve of a great birth, and that a mighty change is taking place before our eyes. In the

expressive words of a great Indian Administrator, now the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces, quoted from one of the greatest books of the human race—the dry bones in the open valley have become instinct with life. It was not in vain that Ramgopal Ghose or Hurrish Chunder Mukerjea, or Kristo Dass Pal or Keshub Chunder Sen lived and died. It was not in vain that they sacrificed their precious lives for the cause to which they were wedded. We are about to enter into the rich possession of that splendid legacy of high ideals and lofty aspirations which they have bequeathed to us and which it will be for us to transmit untarnished to after-generations. A thousand circumstances have contributed to bring about this change—a thousand factors have combined to produce this grand result. The spread of English education, the increasing contact with the West, the extended means of communication opened up with the most distant parts of the empire, are among the circumstances which must account for the phenomenon which is passing before our eyes. The East and the West have been brought into intimate contact and close communion. The East has been galvanized by the West. The Promethean spark of life has been communicated into the dead bones of Eastern society, and we stand forth, regenerated, disenthralled, emancipated by the genius of liberty and learning. It seems to me inconceivable that any section of the English community in India or any one bearing the honoured name of Englishman can view with aught but feelings of deep gratification and intense pleasure the wonderful event that is transpiring before our eyes; for it constitutes in my humble judgment the noblest monument of British rule, its most enduring title to glory and fame. I can conceive nothing more honourable to England, nothing more glorious, even in the matchless record of her fame, than that under the protection of England and through influences of her creation a great and ancient nation should be restored to life and liberty.

The mighty change which is taking place before our eyes

and which is the most prominent feature of the political situation is accompanied by national movements of great magnitude of which the National Congress is the most conspicuous. The National Congress represents the consummation of the dream of ages. The beatific vision of Indian Unity which had warmed the hearts and inspired the energies of Indian patriots is about to be accomplished. It seems to me to be inconceivable that any section of the Indian community should stand aloof from this movement. The movement is universal—it promises good to all. The concessions which the National Congress presses for will benefit Hindoos, Mohamedans, Christians alike—all sections and all classes of our somewhat mixed community. Let us descend from the abstract to the concrete—let us take specific instances. The National Congress prays for the separation of judicial from executive functions in the administration of criminal justice. If the boon is conceded and the reform is carried out, will not the administration of justice be placed on a better and more improved footing, and will it not be an advantage to Hindoos and Mohamedans alike? Again, the National Congress presses for the repeal of the Arms Act, the establishment of a military college and the enlistment of natives of India as volunteers. Will not these concessions represent a distinct advantage to every class and section of the community? In respect of one matter—and only one—can I perceive the possibility of any difference of opinion. If the councils are partially reconstituted upon a representative basis, if the members of our Councils are in part elected by our local bodies, it may be said that the Hindoos being in a majority will swamp the Mahomedans. The slightest examination of the programme of the Congress will dispel such an illusion. Only one-half of the members of the Legislative Councils will be elected—the other half will still continue to be nominated by the Government; and may we not safely trust the Government to safeguard the interests of the Mohamedan minority? But such a question can only arise on the assumption that

there is a conflict of interest between Hindoos and Mohamedans and that the Hindoos are the natural enemies of their Mohamedan fellow-countrymen. Is that so? I appeal to the facts of history—to the bright record of Moslem annals in India. Throughout the long period of Mohamedan history, Hindoos and Mohamedans lived like brothers and on terms of mutual trust and mutual confidence. The grandsons of those who had fought against Babar and had opposed the establishment of his Empire became Ministers and Generals and Rulers of Provinces under the sway of his successors. Beer Bul and Todar Mull and Raja Man Singh were the Ministers, the Captains and Warriors of the great Empire founded by Akber, and the policy of Akber became the policy of the Moghul Empire. The relations which existed between Hindoos and Mohamedans, the terms on which they lived together will appear from an extract which I shall presently read. It is a remonstrance which Jeswant Singh—Maharaja of Jodhpur, a feudatory Prince of the Empire and a general in the Moghul Army—addressed to the bigoted and fanatical Aurangzebe when he was persecuting the Hindoos for their religion. We know the relations which now exist between the Paramount Power and the feudatory Chiefs, and I will undertake to say that no native Chief in these days would have ventured to address such a remonstrance to the British Government. With Political Agents of the type of Sir Lepel Griffin, they would soon find out their mistake. Here then is the letter to which I have referred :—

"Your royal ancestor M. Jalal-ud-din Akber conducted the affairs of the Empire in dignity and safety for fifty-two years, keeping every tribe and class in peace and prosperity ; whether they were followers of Jesus, or of Moses, or of Mahomed ; were they Brahmins, were they [Atheists] ; all equally enjoyed his countenance and favour. Insomuch that his subjects distinguished him by the title of "Protector of the Human Race."

"His Majesty M. Nur-ud-din Jahangir also extended for a period of twenty-two years the shadow of his protection over his peoples' heads ; successful by constant fidelity to his allies, and vigorous exertions in the affairs of State.

"Nor less did the illustrious Shah Jahan, by a propitious reign of thirty-two years, acquire to himself immortal fame, the just reward of clemency and righteousness.

"During your Majesty's reign many have been alienated from the Empire and further losses must ensue, since devastation and rapine reign without restraint.

"How can the dignity of a sovereign be preserved who employs his power in exacting heavy tribute from a people miserably reduced? At this juncture it is said, from East to West, that the Emperor of Hindoostan, jealous of the poor Hindoo devotee, will exact tribute from Brahmins etc; that, regardless of the honor of his Timurian ancestry, he condescends to exercise his strength against the inoffensive religious solitary. If your Majesty places any faith in those books by distinction called divine, you may there learn that God is the God of all mankind, not of Mussalmans only. The Pagan and the Moslem stand alike before him. In your Mosques, it is in His name that the call to prayer is uttered. In a house of idols, where the bell is rung, it is still He that is the object of adoration. To vilify the religious customs of other men is to set at naught the will of the Almighty. *When we deface a picture we necessarily incur the resentment of the painter."—Extract from the letter of Raja Jeswant Sing to Aurangzebe.*

Observe the manliness, the tone of self-respect and warm concern which the writer feels for the safety and the glory of the Moghul Empire; and he was a Hindoo and a Rajput Chief. But why appeal to facts of history? Let us come down to more recent times and observe contemporary events. The facts which I am about to submit for your consideration occurred less than a year ago and at Murshedabad, the centre of Mohamedan power and influence in Bengal. There was a dispute between the Sunnis and the Ferazis about religious matters. Their differences became strong and it was difficult to perceive an easy way to the settlement of the points at issue. At length it was resolved to hold a meeting. A meeting was called, attended by the representatives of the two sects and by a few Hindoo gentlemen and Christian missionaries. The discussions were long and protracted. But the prospects of a settlement were as distant as ever. At length it was resolved to refer the matter to arbitration. And will you believe it

that the judges who were selected to settle matters vitally affecting the religious concerns of the Mohamedan community of Murshidabad were all Hindoos! And yet we are told in spite of the facts of history, in spite of the evidence of existing relations, that Hindoos and Mohamedans are not on friendly terms and that the enmity between the two communities is growing. No such thing. It is an artificial enmity that is being kept up by interested parties for purposes of their own. No, we are brothers united by birth, by language, by the indissoluble ties of nature. He who tries to sunder us wages war against the Majesty of the Most High. I see around me a large number of my Hindoo and Mohamedan fellow-countrymen. I would appeal to them and through them to my countrymen at large to forget their petty little differences and unite for the promotion of the true interests of their common country. I would also appeal to the representatives of the native Press, and I would venture to remind them of their solemn responsibilities and of the duty which they owe to their country in the present critical state of things, to practice forbearance and to treat with the utmost indulgence and temperance of expression all questions affecting the interests of the Mohamedan community.

The reconstitution of the Legislative Councils is the most important of the public questions of the day, and it has repeatedly engaged the attention of the Congress; and here again the Indian Association has taken the start of all other public bodies in the land. For in 1882, at an annual meeting of the Association, held in this very hall—this historic hall which has witnessed so many gatherings of our citizens—a Committee was appointed to consider this question, and the programme of reform suggested by the Association is practically the programme which has been adopted by the Congress. I will not here enter into a detailed consideration of this programme, but will content myself by briefly stating the outlines. We want that the Legislative Councils should be re-

constituted upon a partially representative basis, one-half of the members being elected—elected not indeed by people unfit to exercise the franchise—the ignorant peasantry of the country—but by local bodies which in their turn are representative in their character. Under the Indian Council's Act at least one-third of the members must be non-officials. All that we want is that the proportion of non-official members should be raised from one-third to one-half, and that they should be elected. The next part of our programme is that the Councils thus constituted should be allowed to discuss the Budget, and that the members should enjoy the right of interpellation, which would be the safeguard of the people's rights and at the same time place at the disposal of the Government a handy agency to correct false and exaggerated statements. Such are the brief outlines of our programme. It was affirmed in the First Congress in 1885, re-affirmed in 1886 and again in 1887 in the Madras Congress. But are we to go on affirming and re-affirming this programme from year's end to year's end? Does that mark the measure and the limit of our duties in this respect? No, we must initiate an agitation as thorough, as universal, and as effective for the purposes for which it was undertaken, as the great agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws. Do you for one moment think that the Government will concede to you this great boon for the mere asking of it? No Government has ever exhibited such rare generosity. No, we must ask and pray and agitate, give the Government no rest, no peace until it has conceded to us those institutions which are the birth-right of British subjects and are in such entire unison with the traditions of British rule. Knock and it shall be opened is a memorable Christian precept, but it is not more true in religion than it is in the domain of politics. But how is this agitation to be conducted? What lines are we to follow? Well I believe there is in that bundle of papers two memorials regarding the re-constitution of the Legislative Councils—one addressed to the Secretary of

State and the other to the Imperial Parliament. As regards the memorial to Parliament, let us have at least a million signatures—covering the floor of the House of Commons from end to end. These signatures coming from a strange people and written in strange characters will not fail to create an impression in the House of Commons. They would be the expression of our earnestness as they would be a powerful instrument for the education of our people. The Congress with its programme for the reconstitution of our Legislative Councils is the most significant sign of the situation. But the Congress is the Congress of the nation, and the nation dwells in the cottage. It is too often brought as a charge against us that we are lacking in sympathy with the masses. Is that so? No, we are beginning to feel that in all our movements for the public good, we must take the people with us. The voice of the people is the voice of God. And that voice must speak in tones of thunder before it can be the omnipotent voice to which a great Government must submit. Our mass-meetings are a powerful means of popular education. They kindle the flames of public spirit in the remote moffusil and raise the first flicker of joy and hope in desolate tracts. It is a blessed work—it is God's work—the noblest on earth. What could be nobler or more truly righteous than to raise the meek and the lowly in spirit and to breathe into their desponding souls the glad tidings of joy and hope. I have visited the peasant in his rustic home and I have heard from his own quivering lips the tale of his sorrows: and the best moments of my life have been those in which I have been of some service to the down-trodden peasantry of Bengal.

The activity of our public bodies is the most happy sign of the times and is the most pleasing feature of the political situation. It is an activity however which is not confined to efforts in this country. You are probably aware that there is an organization in this country which sends every week telegraphic despatches to London with a view to counteract the mischievous

telegrams of our old friend, the Calcutta Correspondent of the *Times*. The performances of this gentleman are well known to us. Not unfrequently he draws pretty freely upon his imagination, but we are anxious to neutralize the results of his occasional excursions into the domain of fancy. In this connection I am reminded of a funny story which I heard some years ago. The Shah of Persia was in London and a river-trip for his pleasure had been organized. The inevitable newspaper reporters were there, and they had their special steamer. As the Shah came up every one was on deck with the exception of one luckless individual who was down below in his cabin. "Why are you here? The Shah is coming" was the very natural remark of a brother reporter. "No matter," replied the other. "They will all tell lies and I will add a few of my own and make up my report." The story may represent an extreme case; and it is not meant to apply to the Correspondent of the *Times*. But our countrymen are quite right in forming an organization of their own to thwart the tactics of their opponents. There is another direction in which the activity of our countrymen in England will ere long, we hope, be crowned with splendid results. We earnestly hope that the next general elections will return a native of India to Parliament; and I am quite sure I express the sense of this great meeting, and I hope that my friends here, Mr. Mehta and Mr. Padsha, will be the bearer of our message to Bombay, that in case Mr. Dadabhai Nowroji is returned, we shall rejoice quite as heartily as the people of Bombay. There is yet one other direction in which the activity of our countrymen is manifest in England. We are now engaged in establishing an Indian agency in London for ventilating Indian questions in England. The English people are always ready to do justice to us, but they have not the necessary knowledge, and absorbed in the exciting controversies nearer home, they do not always feel the necessary degree of inclination to take up Indian questions. An agency of our own by creating an

interest in Indian questions and placing accurate information regarding them before the British public would remove a great and long-felt want. It is estimated that the Agency will cost about Rs. 15,000 a year, of which amount Bengal will have to contribute Rs. 5,000, representing one-third of the entire expense, the rest coming from Bombay and Madras. I appeal to you for subscription in aid of this object. It would be a matter of infinite shame, if so small a sum should not be raised in this rich Province, and for so great a purpose.

Such then are the principal circumstances which mark the political situation, and such are the outward manifestations of the situation. But there are certain principles which give it colour and shape and determine its character. Deep and unswerving loyalty to the British Crown and constitutional agitation for our rights are the words which are written on the banner of every public body in the land and are graven on the heart of every Indian Patriot. We are agitators—I have been one for the last fifteen years and mean to be so till the last breath of my life—and it is too often the practice to call us seditionists—veiled seditionists, in the euphemistic language of the *Pioneer*. We are seditionists! No, we are loyal subjects of the Crown—far more loyal than those who dance attendance in the ante-chambers of Secretaries, and court the smiles of high officials. We are the best friends of the British Government. We seek by removing grievances to deepen and consolidate the foundations of British rule, and to place it broad-based upon the affections of the people. For my own part I have a high sense of the mission of England in this country. I regard the connection between England and India as providential. England is here for the noblest of purposes—the noblest ever marked out in clear lines of light in the annals of any race or country—to regenerate and elevate a great and ancient people, and to bring back to them their long-lost glories. But if England has a mission, we too have our own.

I complain that we have not shown an adequate appreciation of the responsibilities of our mission. Some years ago I complained of the paucity of our workers. I repeat the complaint and will continue to do so, until the occasion for it has been removed. Where are our workers—where are the missionaries of the new faith—the apostles of New India? We want men with indomitable energy, fiery earnestness and profound convictions, who wedded to our cause will not turn back from the plough. We live in stirring times when every man must sacrifice what he has to sacrifice, for the sake of his country—the rich man his wealth—the man of culture his time and talent—the poor man whatever he may possess in this world. Then and then only will rise that noble national structure—the temple of our unity and political emancipation—which will satisfy the requirements of the present age and the hopes of the future.

THE RAM MOHAN ROY ANNIVERSARY MEETING.

The following address was delivered by Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea at the 55th Anniversary Meeting of Raja Ram Mohan Roy held at the Town Hall on 27th September, 1888. The gathering was very large—probably the largest on the occasion and several Hindoo ladies graced the occasion with their presence. The Hon'ble Dr. Mahendra Lal Sircar was in the chair.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

It seems to me to be a happy and encouraging sign of the times that we should thus meet from year to year to commemorate the anniversary of the death of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, and I must say that the community—I do not speak of

the Brahmo community but of the larger community comprising all sects and creeds interested in the preservation of the memory of our great men—are under heavy obligations to the Committee for thus continuing these celebrations. It does us good thus to meet once a year round the tombs of our great men. Their ashes are never extinguished, but they glow with an ever-increasing brilliancy till they fill the whole land with their lustre and their illumination. The holy man dies, but his spirit survives him and speaks from amid the silence of the tomb with a voice of thunder. Fifty years ago and more, Ram Mohan Roy sank into his grave in a distant land amid the faithful tears ("no faithless tears" in the language of the sonnets) of his English friends, but unwept and unhonoured by his countrymen at large. They regarded him as an outcast and his death in a foreign land as perhaps the just punishment, the merited visitation of Providence, for his open defiance of the religion of his fathers. For years he lay unnoticed in the humble tomb which the piety of his English friends had raised for him, and it was not until the arrival of Dwarkanath Tagore in England that a suitable monument was raised over the remains of the greatest Hindoo reformer of modern times. What a change has since taken place. The grandsons of those who regarded Ram Mohan Roy as an outcast, a heretic, as one unfit to be associated with, are now gathered round his tomb to make atonements for the sins of the past, to redeem an unfulfilled duty, and above all to draw from him—aye from his yet unextinguished ashes—the inspiration for whatever is honourable in life, noble in conduct, and true in religion, morals, politics, in the struggle for social reform. The ceremony would descend into a dead and meaningless form if divorced from such a purpose as this. This ceremony would only then be instinct with life and replete with interest when associated with such a high moral purpose. Ram Mohan Roy is the mightiest product of English influences so far as they have yet displayed themselves, as Chaitanya was the

mightiest product of Mohamedan influences in Bengal. There is a striking similarity in the circumstances which produced these wonderful men. A great man, it has been truly remarked, is the product of his age, the reflex of the energies of his time, the embodiment of the forces of his epoch. A great man is such as his age makes him, but he is something more. He reacts upon the age, carries it to a further stage of progress, be it in morals, politics or in religion. He gives back to the age more than what he has received from it. The age has poured into the lap of its gifted son its choicest gifts. The hero improves, refines, and embellishes them and repays them back with compound interest. Thus the age is illustrated, adorned and ennobled in the personality of its most gifted representative. Chaitanya rose as a living protest against the abominations of Tantric worship. The struggle between Vaishnavism and Sakta worship had already commenced. The Bacchanalian orgies of those times were a disgrace to the age. Human nature rose in revolt against them. There is a divinity within us which rough-hew it as we may will amid darkness and despair re-assert its sovereignty. There are depths beyond which human nature will not go. The divine element comes to the rescue. In the hearts of others, it speaks tremulously, in half-broken accents and in moments of temporary illumination. In the heart of the prophet, it glows with heavenly radiance. It is an all-consuming fire. It absorbs him and overpowers him and bodies itself forth in language of deep, burning and passionate conviction. Thus rose Chaitanya, the exponent of the purity, the moral forces and the religious energies of his times. But he brought to the age something which it did not possess, something which was his own, something derived from the abundance of his own nature. He breathed into it the sweet spirit of love—the spirit of *bhukti*—that spirit of charity of which St. Paul speaks and which finds such striking illustration in the triumphant sufferings of the martyred souls of humanity.

When Ram Mohan Roy appeared on the scene the struggle between Sakta worship and Vaishnavism was in full operation. It was indeed the old struggle between right and wrong, between the principle of light and that of darkness. Ram Mohan Roy was peculiarly situated as regards this struggle. On his father's side he was a *Vaishnava*; on his mother's he was a *Sakta*. It seemed as if these two contending systems of thought had after ages of conflict and struggle met together in the same family to produce the greatest religious reformer of modern India who singularly enough was neither a *Sakta* nor a *Vaishnava*, but sought to restore the religion of his fathers to its pristine purity. Ram Mohan Roy was singularly well-equipped for this struggle. Inferior to Chaitanya in the inexhaustible resources of deep spirituality and boundless love, he was superior to him in the incisiveness of his logic, in the breadth of his intellect which excited the admiration of the most gifted minds of Europe and in the keener appreciation and firmer grasp of the situation which he displayed as the result of superior culture and deeper insight. Chaitanya was such as Sanskrit learning and Mohamedan influences and his own sweet spirituality had made him. Ram Mohan Roy was the product of these factors, but he associated with them the inestimable benefit of English culture. I fear we are not always sufficiently alive to the deep debt which we owe to the Moslem rulers of India from a religious point of view. At the time of the Mohamedan conquest the country was sunk in ignorance and superstition. To Islam belongs the credit of keeping alive in the recollections of our people the principles of that monotheistic creed which Ram Mohan Roy sought to read in the olden records of our race. Ram Mohan Roy was deeply versed in Sanskrit as well as in Arabic, and from the outset stood forth as the champion of monotheism. But the method which he followed was peculiar and singularly characteristic of the man and the reformer. He sought to build upon the old foundations, but only so far as they were

compatible with truth. The truth he worshipped; the truth he loved; the truth was the adorable divinity of his heart. God knows what he suffered for the sake of truth. But deep as was his attachment to the truth, he likewise reverenced the past. His was no violent alienation, no bitter estrangement, no sudden cutting adrift from the sheet-anchors of the past. Of course everything that the past taught was not true. There was in it a good deal of "transcendental nonsense" in the expressive language of your illustrious chairman. But here and there amid the decayed ruins of ancient Indian greatness there were to be found gems of priceless value. These he treasured up; these he carefully studied, and these he incorporated into that system of progressive religion of which he was to be the immortal founder. So will it always be with the march of reform, whether it be in religion, morals or politics. The history of the English constitution is the history of steady and continuous progress, due to no violent changes, to no violent remedies, but to careful up-building upon the foundations of the past. English reform has always been actuated by deep reverence for the past, combined with careful attention to the requirements of the present and presided over by the all-pervading spirit of truth. The history of the world furnishes the instance of a conspicuous departure from these lessons, followed by conspicuous failure. The French Revolutionaries in the wildness of their revolutionary zeal dethroned their king and brought him to the guillotine. They disestablished their church, expelled the clergy, confiscated church property, and to complete the measure of their development in this new direction, they installed Reason as an object of worship in place of Almighty God. The retribution soon came. The reaction was a hundred fold more bitter and intense than the fury of that revolutionary zeal which had precipitated these changes. Those who had expelled their king and had massacred him and the members of his family submitted to a millitary despotism, the little finger

of which was thicker than the loins of Louis XVI. Those who had disestablished the church and had expelled the priesthood, were once again amid tears and penances, received back into the bosom of the Catholic Church; and to mark the crowning triumph of the Church, the Pope came all the way from Rome to Paris to crown Napoleon as the anointed sovereign of France. The apostle of monotheism, the founder of the Brahmo Samaj, the activity of Ram Mohan Roy was not confined to religious matters. Religion shaped and guided his conduct. Deep religious convictions formed the nutriment of his soul as they were the crowning glory of his life. But he knew that duty to God comprised duty to man, and the most acceptable way of serving the Almighty is by serving his creatures. The activity of his political life was not the least conspicuous feature of his career. In these days, political agitation is viewed with disfavor and political agitators are regarded as a mischievous class. However that may be, we who belong to that class and glory in it claim Ram Mohan Roy as our leader, our guide, our revered preceptor in the difficult struggle for political regeneration. He advocated the freedom of the Press at a time when the Press was not yet free. He advocated the separation of judicial from executive functions at a time when nobody had apparently thought of the reform; and this is a reform which the National Congress urges from year to year, and urges in vain. With the prescience of genius as if anticipating an evil which did not prevail in his own time and which it was reserved for Lord Salisbury to bring about in these days, he deprecated the appointment of men who were too young to offices in the Civil Service. Ram Mohan Roy suggested 22 years as the minimum limit of age for admission into the Covenanted Service. The Public Service Commission have recommended 23 years as the maximum limit of age. I have heard it said that religous reformers should not take part in politics. Why not? Is not politics a part our duty? And does not religion

embrace the whole circle of our duties? Yes, politics based upon religion or deep moral earnestness is the one thing that is needful for this country. Politics divorced from a high moral purpose becomes the paltry squabble for power in which humanity can feel no interest. Take the case of the Home Rule agitation. Withdraw from it the personality of Mr. Gladstone and his intense moral earnestness, withdraw from it the deep fervour of the Irish patriots, and it becomes a miserable struggle for political power in which the deeper interests of humanity are lost sight of. Take again the case of the pilgrim fathers, the founders of American greatness. They were not allowed to worship God in their own country according to the light of their consciences. They preferred exile to the miseries of a life where their conscientious convictions had to be sacrificed. They crossed the ocean and settled in a foreign land. They established their own religion and their own Government. They developed themselves into statesmen and became the founders of the noblest Government and freest race that the world has ever seen.

The first of political agitators, the founder of the Brahmo Samaj, Ram Mohan Roy was also the first of Indian social reformers. What is the essence of social reform? What is its first and last word—its vitalizing principle? All social reform consists in the elevation of women, the removal of their disabilities and the restoration to them of that position of dignity and honour which is theirs by right. Ram Mohan Roy was singularly well-equipped for this task. The fertilizing stream of deep motherly affection had been poured into his lap from his earliest years. Nay more, when driven from home by the persecuting hand of his relatives and he wandered among the wilds of Thibet, it was again the protecting arm of a woman that saved him from a violent death. He had throughout his life received in rich abundance the sweet and healing balsam of womanly affection. How could he disregard their claims upon his consideration? He knew how sweet

and loving and tender Hindoo women were; and it was therefore with a sense of cruel agony that he saw perpetrated before his eyes the deadly horrors of Suttee. I have read the opinion expressed somewhere—I believe in a journal or in some book —that Suttee when voluntarily performed represents the highest effort of womanly sacrifice and devotion to the memory of a dead husband. I regret I cannot accept this view of the matter. Is there no other means of illustrating womanly regard for a departed husband except by recourse to a practice from which human nature recoils with horror and indignation? Is it to be supposed that Hindoo widows are now less devoted to the memory of their dead husbands than they were in the time of Ram Mohan Roy, because forsooth they do not enjoy the liberty of immolating themselves on the funeral pyre! Against such an assumption, I desire to enter my most emphatic protest. It would be nothing less than a libel on the womanhood of our race; for though I am a warm advocate of widow-marriage, I must observe that for purity of character, meekness of disposition and devoted self-sacrifice, the Hindoo widow is an ornament to her race and her sex. Well against this cruel rite Ram Mohan Roy commenced a crusade. The first pamphlet that he wrote on the subject was in 1818, and it was not till 1829 that the law was passed by which Suttee was declared penal. For 11 years, he continued the agitation. Hindoo society rose in arms against him. He never hesitated, never faltered, but with the calm clear eye of faith into the things of the future, he continued his work, till the victory was his. I have read it stated in the columns of an influential English journal—*The Saturday Review*—that the credit of the reform does not belong to Ram Mohan Roy in a special sense, but that he was one of a band of reformers who for sometimes had been pressing for it. The question is not of any great difficulty. It can be easily settled by a reference to a few facts. Ram Mohan Roy was the first to advocate the reform; he was its most persistent advocate. When at last, the law

was passed, he went to England armed with a petition to support it, against the protestations of the *Dharma Shabha.* But this is not all. Without him the law could never have been passed. The Government felt bound by every consideration of honour and expediency not to interfere in a matter which affected the religion of the people. It was not until Ram Mohan Roy had pointed out that Suttee was not sanctioned by religion or the ancient tenets of the Hindoo *Shastras* that the Government felt itself at liberty to take action in the matter and to move in the interests of humanity. But there is one other matter to which the Reviewer refers and to which I would like to call the attention of this meeting. The remark implies a heavy imputation upon the character of the man whose memory we have met here to honour to-night. The Reviewer says that Ram Mohan Roy when Sheristadar or Dewan as he used to be called of Rungpur was in the habit of taking bribes or *honoraria* as he euphemistically puts it. Now if there were any foundation for this charge we should be bound to consider it very carefully, for however great might be our attachment to the memory of Ram Mohan Roy our veneration for truth is still greater. But what is the ground for making this imputation? The Reviewer asserts that Ram Mohan Roy left behind him a large fortune. Now this is a matter which is capable of precise arithmetical calculation. What was the fortune that he left behind and which has afforded the Reviewer the opportunity for making this charge? The so-called splendid fortune which he left behind consisted of a house and garden in Calcutta (which of course were not so valuable then as they would be now) and his paternal estate heavily encumbered with a debt of nearly 32,000 Rupees! It is upon such flimsy grounds that this grave charge has been preferred. A nation's character is its most sacred possession and the character of our leaders is doubly dear to us; and he who seeks to rob us of that is an enemy to the best interests of our people. I am sure the feeling of this

great meeting will be one of deep indignation against such a baseless and unworthy charge.

The social reformer, the founder of the Brahmo Somaj, the first of political agitators, the claims of the Raja to the gratitude of his countrymen have not yet been exhausted. He was also the founder of Bengalee Prose literature and the first of Bengalee journalists. There is hardly a field of public usefulness which he left unoccupied. Ladies and gentlemen, I do not know what your own feelings on the subject may be, but I venture to think that those who are engaged in the great task of improving our language, adorning it and perfecting it for the varied purposes of speech are among the truest benefactors of our race. Their acheivements are the most durable; their fame immortal. In the progressive development of the human race it is possible to realize a time when the fame of a Marlborough or of a Wellington may be forgotten and the memory of their victories may pass out of the mind. But the immortal creations of a Chaucer, a Shakespear and a Milton, the wonderful accession of vigor to the English language introduced by an Addison, a Bolingbroke or a Burke will always linger in the recollections of the English-speaking races. They have endowed the people with the richest heritage. When the history of our people comes to be written, as I trust it will be written by no unfaithful hand, the highest place will be accorded to the conscript fathers of our language; and in the immortal rolls of fame there are few names that will stand higher than those of Ram Mohan Roy, Iswar Chunder Gupta, Madhusudan Dutta, Akshoy Kumar Dutta, Iswar Chundra Vidyasagar, Hem Chunder Banerjea, and last but not least of the glorious band, Bunkim Chundra Chatterjee.

Such was Ram Mohan Roy and such was the nature of his achievements. Our national life may be said to flow from him as from a fountain. His labours have shaped the whole course of national development. Before him all was dark and gloomy. The sun of Chaitanya had long set, and the firmament was

covered with deep gloom. Then rose Ram Mohan Roy, the apostle of modern progress. Others have followed him. Keshub Chunder Sen, Kristo Das Pal, Ram Gopal Ghose have come and gone, but they were no more fit to wear his mantle than we are to wear theirs. I fear we have not been sufficiently respectful to the memory of Ram Mohan Roy. Three years ago you resolved to raise a national memorial in his honour. Where is this memorial? Your Town Hall is filled with the statues, busts and portraits of lesser luminaries. I do not grudge them these honours which no doubt they richly deserve. But where is the memorial in honour of the greatest Hindoo reformer of modern times? I ask you to redeem the honour of your race, to make good your blighted faith and to rescue the national character from the stain of dark ingratitude. But above all, gentlemen, I would ask you to raise in the temples of your hearts a monument that would be worthy of the great Raja. Purify your souls, hold communion with his blessed spirit, seek to elevate yourselves to the height of his moral greatness and to assimilate his principles and his teachings into your every-day conduct; and then you will have raised a memorial not unworthy of the great Raja or of this occasion and one which would be in conformity with the spirit of his teachings.

THE FOURTH NATIONAL CONGRESS.

At the Fourth National Congress at Allahabad (26th to 29th December, 1888), Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea in seconding the Resolution regarding the expansion of the Legislative Councils which was moved by the Hon'ble K. T. Telang, spoke as follows:—

BROTHER-DELEGATES,

I cannot shut my eyes to the grave responsibility which I incur in common with my leader in having to speak to this Resolution. It is the most important Resolution in your programme. You have chosen to put it on the forefront among the topics to be discussed by this Congress. Round it have gathered that mass of misconceptions which the organs of your public opinion have been at so much pains to dispel. It has been the chief theme of controversy and of complaint. It is the one point in your armour against which your opponents have hurled their sharpest darts with merciless severity and with unflagging steadiness. For my part I may say that I welcome this opposition. I rejoice at it, and I thank God with all my heart that it has pleased Him in His inscrutable Providence to subject us to this ordeal and chastening influence of this severe discipline. Nothing but good can come out of it. Causes the noblest, the most beneficent, the most far-reaching in their consequences for good have never prospered or triumphed except under the stress of adverse criticism. Comparing great things with small, I may say that the noblest page of Christian history has always appeared to me to be that which records the triumphant sufferings and is ensanguined with the blood of the martyrs of early Christianity. There is nothing more attractive in Moslem annals than that which

describes Mohamed as flying from the hands of his persecuting relatives, seeking a home and an asylum at Medina, and there installing himself as king, prophet, priest, the deliverer of his people. So in our case, the opposition will do nothing but good. It will put us on our mettle and bring out all that is good in us. Lord Dufferin has done us a service the magnitude of which it is impossible to exaggerate. He has done for you by his speech at St. Andrew's dinner what you could not have done for yourselves by twenty years of persistent agitation. By one great bound—a big jump into the unknown—the National Congress has taken its place among the foremost topics of discussion in English political circles and has arrested the attention of the leading English politicians. The National Congress and the expansion of your Legislative Councils are now being discussed by the firesides of English homes, around the tables of English clubs and upon the platforms of English public meetings. Not the least valuable of your acquisitions has been that of Mr. Gladstone. Only three months ago, in a conversation with the Nawab of Hyderabad, he professed ignorance of the programme of the Congress and thought that it was associated in some way with Mr. Malabari's agitation. But mark what he said only the other day in his Lime-house speech. He spoke in terms of strong sympathy with the National Congress and observed :—" It will not do for us to treat with contempt or even with indifference the rising aspirations of this great people." When a statesman in the position of Mr. Gladstone, long the Prime Minister of England, still the trusted leader of a great party, the hope of Ireland—its future deliverer—holds views such as these, we may say with confidence that we are within measurable distance of victory (tremendous cheering, the audience rising up). I hope and trust the mighty voice of a great nation would go forth from this hall and be wafted across mountains, seas and deserts and reach the ears of Mr. Gladstone as the expression of our personal regard for him and of our sympathy for his labours.

I must say that it is with a sense of pain that I listened to the statement made by the Hon'ble Pundit Ajudhyanath regarding the petty official opposition which the efforts of the Reception Committee encountered at each stage. When the story of this spiteful and unworthy persecution is published in this country and when it is repeated in England, I am sure there will be one universal feeling of indignation throughout the country, which I hope will teach the local officials a lesson which they have yet to learn. I must say that it seems to me a marvel that there should be any misconception with regard to the nature of our demands. "Demands" do I say? We have really made none. We have put forth some tentative suggestions regarding the reform and expansion of the Legislative Councils. We pin our faith to no particular systems, to no special programme. We say so in terms as clear as the resources of the English language can supply. We say (and I quote the very words of the Resolution of 1886) "whatever may be the scheme that may be adopted, care should be taken that all sections of the community and all great interests are adequately represented." All that we pray for—all that the Congress has ever asked for—is the acceptance in a modified form of the representative principle in the constitution of the Legislative Councils, with a due regard for the interests of all sections of the community. I will not hesitate to say that it seems to me to be inexplicable that there should be any misconception with regard to our programme. There is a singular vein of inconsistency running through much of what has been said and written on the subject by our official critics. Sir Auckland Colvin says in that letter with which we are all so familiar and of which I desire to speak with the utmost possible respect that he saw nothing to object to in the programme of the first Congress, nothing to object to in the proceedings of the second Congress. But then there came a reaction in his mind when he read the Report of the third Congress. If there was nothing to object to in the proceedings of the first and the

second Congresses, does it stand to reason that he should take exception to the third, which re-affirmed the most important Resolutions of the second Congress? But then there are the catechisms which have upset the official classes and account for this change of feeling. I am not here to defend the catechisms on this platform and they are quite able to take care of themselves. But it is in connection with this charge of sedition that is too often so recklessly brought against us that I desire in your name and on your behalf (and in this matter re-echoing the sentiments of the Chairman of the Reception Committee) to enter my most emphatic protest. Apart from sentimental considerations—which are no mean considerations with a people so highly sensitive and emotional as ourselves,—is it for one moment to be supposed that we have become so idiotic and have taken such utter leave of our senses as not to see that we owe all that we possess—our position and our prestige—to the English connection? Let that connection come to an end, and we lose with it all that we hold most dear in life. Our opponents have charged us with being seditionists, but they have never failed to give us credit for sense. In our case however sedition means a measure of folly that is only consistent with idiotcy. The charge can only stand upon the one assumption that the educated community of India have become demented. For my part I may say, and I believe that in this matter I express the sense of this great Congress that I regard the connection between England and India as Providential and that England is here for one of the noblest purposes of history. I can find nothing more glorious in the matchless record of England's fame than that under her influence this mighty national awakening should take place which finds its highest expression in this great and historical gathering of the National Congress.

Our programme for the expansion and reform of the Legislative Councils which we are called upon to re-affirm by this Resolution is extremely moderate. It is neither a Parliamentary

system, nor representative government, nor the application of democratic methods to Indian institutions that we seek for. Our demand is much more moderate than that. All that we want is to rescue the present Legislative Councils from their character as monstrous shams and convert them into useful consultative assemblies. We desire to place non-official opinion on organized footing for purposes of consultation by the Government. Non-official opinion is consulted now. We say it should be consulted in a more formal and methodical manner. We have no wish to assume sovereign authority. The supreme power will remain where it is vested at present. We only desire that we may be consulted in its exercise. According to our programme, half the members of the Legislative Councils are to be elected, the rest being nominated by Government. Under the existing law, one-third of the members must at least be non-officials. We pray for an increase in the proportion of non-official members from one-third to one-half, and we further suggest that they should be elected. We attach the utmost importance to the principle of election. A partially elective system is the platform on which we take our stand. That platform we can never quit, and by it we shall judge every system which may be devised for the reform of the Councils. The next point in our programme is that the Budgets should be discussed in Council; and in this respect we only want a partial extension of a principle already admitted and acted upon. The Budget is now discussed in the Supreme Council, but only when a new measure of taxation is proposed. The Congress suggests that the Budgets should be discussed on all occasions in the Provincial as well as in the Supreme Council, and whether a new scheme of taxation is proposed or not. There is a singular unanimity of opinion in connection with this part of the programme of the Congress. The Chambers of Commerce throughout the country have repeated the same demand and with marked persistency. Intimately connected with this part of our programme is the

right of interpellation. The discussion of the Budget would become a meaningless and an empty form unless the members had the right of asking questions or calling for papers with regard to items entered in the accounts. Thus even for the satisfactory discussion of the Budget, the right of interpellation is needed. But let it be noted that we want the right to be confined purely to domestic matters. It is therefore a marvel how Lord Dufferin could fall into the mistake that we are anxious to claim authority over military arrangements.

Such in short is our programme for the reform and expansion of the Legislative Councils. But we suffer from misconception. A formidable opposition has been organised against us. The victory however is ours, if we would be only true to ourselves. The signs of a great national awakening are visible on all sides. It may be a portent for good; or it may be a portent for evil. God grant that it may be the harbinger of countless blessings to our country! God grant that it may deepen our loyalty, stimulate our patriotism and consolidate our imperial connection with England! It is for us to lead it into fruitful channels pregnant with good to the people. We shall not be wanting in our duty. Let us press our claims; let us not sleep over the matter, but rather let us agitate, pray and supplicate; and England too will not be wanting in her duty by us. England, the home of the brave, the sanctuary of the free, the asylum of persecuted freedom will not refuse to extend to us in part at least those institutions which have upreared her own greatness and have built up the fabric of her immortal renown. Then will England have enthroned herself in the hearts of our people and will have cemented her connection with India by those ties of love and gratitude which no change of circumstances and no stroke of untoward fate will ever suffice to sever.

AN APPEAL TO THE MOHAMEDAN COMMUNITY TO JOIN THE CONGRESS.

The following speech was delivered by Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea at the great Congress meeting held at Dacca on 1st October, 1888.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN,

This is not the first time that I have had the honour of addressing a great assembly of my countrymen at Dacca. Ten years ago I was here, and you honoured me with a large measure of your attention. The kindly welcome with which I have been overwhelmed from all directions and all classes of the community from the moment that I set my foot in East Bengal is but the token of the renewal of your confidence in me and of your generous appreciation of my humble efforts in the service of my country. Next to the approbation of his own conscience the highest reward which a public man may claim and which he may receive is the applause of his own countrymen. This I have in an unstinted measure, so far as the citizens of Dacca are concerned. Encouraged and supported by it, it shall be the aim of my life in the future, as it has been in the past, to prove myself worthy of that confidence which has been bestowed upon me with such generous profusion. Within the last ten years, a great change has taken place. Not the least noticeable feature of the change has been the introduction of Local Self-Government throughout the country. We owe it to the beneficence of perhaps the greatest Viceroy whom the wisdom of English statesmanship had ever sent out to govern the dominions of the Queen in this part of the world. Local Self-Government has been an unqualified success in all other parts of the country. I hope and trust it will be an

unqualified success so far as Dacca is concerned. But it has been with us a matter of constant complaint and of constant regret (pardon me for this reference) that the citizens of Dacca absorbed in their local politics and in the more exciting controversies nearer home have ceased to feel that degree of of interest which might have been expected of them in regard to those questions of wider import and deeper significance which concern the welfare of the country at large, that in short the capital of East Bengal has abandoned her legitimate position as the leader of thought and the inspirer of public movements in this part of the country. I hope and trust this meeting is the augury of a better state of things, that the sleeping lion has shaken off its slumbers, and that Dacca means once again to re-assert her ancient position as the leader of public opinion in East Bengal. If such be the significance of this meeting, I welcome it with gratitude; and God knows with what raptures of joy it will be welcomed throughout the length and breadth of the land. For at the present moment, the eyes of all our countrymen are strained with feverish interest and expectancy upon our proceedings here, and your attitude will probably determine the attitude of other towns throughout East Bengal.

I have remarked that we are on the eve of a great change. We are on the threshold of a new epoch. The first streaks of the dawn of a new day are already visible on the firmament. The change is striking. It has even attracted the attention of men in high office who are less open to the influence of these changes. Sir John Strachey in a work of his has remarked that "the India of Lord Ripon is no more like the India of Lord Ellenborough than the England of Queen Victoria like the England of Queen Anne." Sir Auckland Colvin, Lieutenant-Governor of the N. W. Provinces, has quoted Biblical language to imply the significance of this change. "The dry bones in the open valley," says he, "have become instinct with life." There is a change deep, profound and significant. The National

Congress is the visible outcome, the highest expression, the noblest embodiment of this new-born spirit of change. In the words of the greatest of Indian statesmen it is the soundest triumph of British administration and a crown of glory to the British Government. England has done great things for India. She has given us peace and blessings of a settled Government. She has intersected the country with railways and telegraphs and other works of public utility. She has given us education, a free press, the inestimable right of free discussion, the handmaid of all knowledge and advancement. But all these pale and dwindle into insignificance when compared with the glory of her present achievement—the awakening of national life and the visible tokens of national revival among a people hitherto sunk in the torpor of ages. It is too often said that these Congress-men are seditionists, not surely by Mr. Kemp, the Editor of *The Bengal Times*, who sits opposite to me. But if we are seditionists, we are at any rate in very good company; for we claim among the friends of the Congress such men as Sir William Hunter, late member of the Viceregal Council, Sir Richard Garth, late Chief Justice of Bengal, Sir Henry Harrison, Chairman of the Calcutta Municipality, and last not least Mr. Cotton, Secretary to the Bengal Government. We are not seditionists at all. We are agitators and I am proud to belong to that class. We claim to be the best friends of the Government. A foreign Government such as ours is unaided by representative institutions, cannot possibly know all our wants and grievances, and we tell the Government what our wants are and thus seek to remove all legitimate cause for complaint. We are loyal and we are patriotic. We are loyal because we are patriotic, because we know and we firmly believe that through the British Government and the British Government alone can we hope to obtain those cherished political rights which English education and English influences have taught us to hanker after.

The National Congress is the Congress of the nation. But

who constitute the nation? Not surely the Hindoos or the Mohamedans alone, but Hindus, Mohamedans, Parsis, Sikhs, Christians—the varied races that inhabit this vast Empire. I claim for the Congress that its programme is the most catholic, the most comprehensive, the most admirably suited to the varied requirements of the different sections of the great Indian community. Its concessions are such as will benefit Hindoos and Mohamedans alike. I want to descend from the abstract to the concrete. I am a journalist, and journalists have a knack of taking a common sense view of things. I will quote chapter and verse. The Congress prays for the separation of judicial from executive functions in the administration of criminal justice. If the concession is granted, will not the administration of justice in the country be improved and placed upon a satisfactory footing? And if so, will not the result be beneficial to Hindoos, Mohamedans and all other sections of the community? The Congress advocates the repeal of the Arms Act, the enlistment of our countrymen as volunteers and the establishment of a Military College in India. Now—I ask—will not these concessions benefit all sections of the community? And I contend that they will benefit the Mohamedan a great deal more than the Hindoo community, for it must be admitted that the Mohamedans represent a noble and a manly community. They still cherish the martial instincts of their sires; and to them far more than to their Hindoo fellow-subjects the concessions to which I have referred will represent an unqualified blessing. But then it is urged that if in accordance with the programme of the Congress, the admission to the higher appointments in the Covenanted Service were to be regulated by competition, the Hindoos would get all the appointments and the Mohamedan community would fare very badly. An argument of this kind implies an absence of faith in the future of Islam in India and in the possibilities of its development which I for one am not prepared to share. I deny altogether that under a system of competitive

examination the higher appointments in the Civil Service would be monopolized by Hindoos and by them alone. It is a matter of unalloyed satisfaction to me, as it must be to the great body of my enlightened Hindoo fellow-citizens, to note the rapid advance which the Mohamedan community have made within the last few years in English culture and English education. Not long ago a Mohamedan gentleman stood first at the B.A. Examination of the Calcutta University: another was first in English in the M.A. Examination; and to a Mohamedan gentleman has been reserved a distinction which no Hindoo has yet been able to achieve in any competitive examination. The worthy son of a worthy sire, Mr. M. Tyabji, the son of the Hon'ble Budrudin Tyabji, stood first at the final examination for the Civil Service of India. With all these facts before me, is it possible to doubt the future of the Mohamedan community in India?—and I must say that it seems to me that those Mohamedan leaders do a distinct disservice to their co-religionists who would discard competition and in violation of the Queen's Proclamation would urge that any section of the community should be advanced to high offices, not by any definite test of merit, but through nomination and the avenues of official favour. Alone in respect of the question of the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils, can there arise any possible difference of opinion. It may be said that if our Legislative Councils were re-constituted upon a partially elective basis the Hindoos being in a majority would completely swamp the Mohamedan minority. But here again the Congress, with that solicitude for the interests of all classes of the community which is its most distinguishing feature, provides a remedy. One-half the appointments are to be made by Government, and surely the Government might be trusted to safeguard the interests of the minority. But this doubt, this hesitation can only arise on the assumption of there being a conflict of interests between Hindoos and Mohamedans. I deny there is any antagonism whatsoever between the two

great races who inhabit this vast continent and who together form the Indian nation. I would appeal to this great gathering of my countrymen and I would appeal to Sir Syed Ahmed Khan himself. He is my authority in this matter. In the expressive language of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, whose present views unhappily are in such direct conflict with the teachings of his life-time—in the words of this venerable man—India is like a fair maid with two eyes, one representing the Hindoo and the other the Mohamedan community. Are we who are her offspring—Hindoos and Mohamedans—are we to deny to her the right of perfect vision? Is she to use only one eye when both are available? No, the advancement of India does not mean the advancement of one community to the exclusion of the rest. It means the progressive development of Hindoos and Mohamedans alike, bound together by the closest ties of good-will and amity, and having in view the advancement of the interests of their common country. Our relations are not of yesterday's growth. Behind us looms the history of eight hundred years of good-will and amity. The records of the world do not present the instance of a wiser or a more beneficent sovereign or one more devoted to the interests of his people than Akber. Let me here relate an unwritten chapter of Moghal history. Having firmly established himself on the throne, Akber sought a matrimonial alliance with a daughter of one of the princely houses of Rajputana. The offer was unique, but coming from the lord of Delhi, the Rajput Princes had no other alternative left than to give it their most serious attention. They at length resolved to accept the offer, but coupled it with conditions which they fully believed would be rejected with scorn. They agreed to enter into this strange alliance with a Mohamedan Sovereign but on the following express conditions:—(1) That the offspring of the marriage should be the heir-apparent and (2) that he should not be circumcised, (Jehangeer, Shah Jehan and Dara Sekoh were not circumcised) and lastly that the Moghals should give up

wearing a particular sort of head-dress to which it appears the Hindoos objected. Such were the conditions of the alliance, and to these Akber unhesitatingly assented, and he thus paved the way for the complete unification of Hindoo and Mohamedan interests which was the crowning glory of his rule as it added to the stability of his house. Thus upon the basis of goodness and beneficence rose the majestic fabric of the Moghal Empire which lasted for 800 years, and which but for the fanaticism of Aurangzebe would have lasted for another 800 years. Raja Man Singh carried the Moghal standard to the frontiers of Afghanistan on the North West, to the wilds of Assam on the East and to the jungles of Orissa on the South. A Hindoo by birth he was allowed by his Mohamedan Sovereign to rule over Moslem populations. Another Hindoo, Raja Todur Mull, consolidated the Empire on a financial basis, while Beer Bull remained to the last moment of his life the favourite companion of his Sovereign. The policy of Akber became the policy of the Moghal Empire and the policy of its Mohamedan subjects. The Mohamedans loved and trusted the Hindoos and the Hindoos reciprocated their kindliness with enthusiastic gratitude. The Moghal Empire has crumbled into atoms. Moslem glory has for ever departed from India. But the cordiality between Hindoos and Mohamedans has survived the wreck of an Empire and the downfall of a great and princely house. It has been truly said that the nation dwells in the villages and in the interior—away from the great towns and the busy centres of trade and commerce. If that be so, I would ask you to mark the relations which exist between Hindoos and Mohamedans in the villages of Bengal. The most endearing terms of domestic relationship are freely interchanged. Brother, cousin, uncle, are the words which Hindoos apply to Mohamedans, and Mohamedans to Hindoos. Yet we are told in spite of these facts, in spite of the clearest evidence to the contrary, that the relations between the two communities are far from being

satisfactory, and that there is a growing sense of estrangement between them. No such thing. We are brothers united by the closest ties which can bind man to man, and let no man seek to sever bonds which nature has fastened with her own hands.

I must say however that I cannot understand an argument which is sometimes brought forward in justification of the attitude of a section of the Mohamedan community in regard to the National Congress. A Nawab of Hyderabad in a conversation which he recently had with Mr. Gladstone gave him to understand that the Mohamedan community had abstained from joining the Congress, because they were unwilling to embarrass the Government. Embarrass the Government by our puny representations! Embarrass this mighty Government which has built up and which so admirably sustains this great fabric of Empire by any representation of grievances which you or I may make! Why I must say that I have a far higher opinion of the strength and the greatness of the British Government in India than to think that we should embarrass it by our representations. So far from doing so, it seems to me that we actually help the Government when we have any petitions to present or any representations to make. But mark the inconsistency of the attitude assumed by the Nawab. What do our public bodies do—the *Anjuman* of this city of which your Chairman is the worthy President and the various *Anjumans* scattered all over the country? Why they seem to be a source of endless embarrassment to the Government, for they are constantly addressing the Government with petitions. If the views of the Nawab are to be accepted, every *Anjuman* in the country should close its doors and give up its appointed work. But perhaps what the Nawab means is that he has no objection to representations coming from particular bodies or associations, but a united expression of opinion such as what the Congress secures is likely to embarrass the Government. A single dose, the Nawab does not

mind; but he objects to the dose being repeated. Common sense and reason rise in revolt against an argument of this description. What is the object of any representation that you may desire to submit to the Government? Surely to obtain some concession or some reform. Is not the concession likely to be forthcoming when many voices pray for it instead of one? These are considerations so obvious that it seems to me a marvel that there should be any doubt with regard to them. But mark the answer that Mr. Gladstone gave. That prince of politicians, the far-seeing statesman, long the Prime Minister of England, quietly heard the Nawab and said that all legitimate and reasonable efforts of the people to represent their requirements to Government commanded his warmest sympathy. Therefore we have this fact that Mr. Gladstone himself approves of constitutional agitation. And the Congress aims at nothing more. I would once again earnestly plead for the sympathy of all sections of the Mohamedan community on behalf of the Congress. The Congress flings its portals wide open for the admission of all—it welcomes all. The Mohamedan community have absolutely nothing to be afraid of from a Hindoo majority. Every possible precaution has been taken to safeguard the interests of the minority. A rule has been introduced at the instance, I believe, of Mr. Budarudin Tyabji which provides that if the Mohamedan Delegates unanimously or nearly unanimously object to any question, it shall not be taken up for discussion by the Congress. The voice of the minority will thus rule the majority in respect of the choice of any question for purposes of deliberation, when the minority have a pretty strong feeling on the subject. I must say that it appears to me to be extremely unreasonable on the part of any section of the community to object to the programme of the Congress and to find fault with it, when they deliberately stand aloof from it. The Congress is open to all; and if it goes wrong surely the only way of preventing it is by joining the Congress and not by criticizing it from

outside or by assuming a hostile position in regard to it. In this connection I must observe that I deplore the language that has been employed by an important member of the Native Press in regard to the Mohamedan community of Bengal. I would give worlds to recall that language. It is as mischievous as it is wide of the truth, and I am perfectly certain that it does not represent in the remotest degree the sentiments of the Hindoo community towards their Mohamedan fellow-countrymen. But let us not quarrel over mere words. Let bye-gones be bye-gones. I would ask you to forget and to forgive. Hindus and Mohamedans! we are brothers; and as brothers sometimes quarrel, so too they always make up their quarrels in the presence of the larger interests of the family. I ask of you Hindoos and Mohamedans to forget your jealousies and your petty differences in the name of your common country and for the promotion of her dearest interests.

PRINCE ALBERT VICTOR RECEPTION MEETING.

A public meeting convened by the Sheriff of Calcutta was held on Friday the 6th December 1889 for the purpose of considering what steps should be taken to give His Royal Highness Prince Albert Victor a fitting reception on his forthcoming visit to Calcutta. Sir Steuart Bayley, K.C.S.I., Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, was voted to the chair. The first Resolution was moved by Moharaja Sir Jotindra Mohan Tagore, K.C.S.I., and seconded by Sir Comer Petheram, Kt., Chief Justice of Bengal, and before it was put to the meeting by the Chairman for its acceptance, Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea rose to move an amendment and in doing so spoke as following:—

YOUR HONOUR,

I rise to move an amendment with your Honor's permission (Applause). My amendment is in these terms:—"That in lieu of the public entertainment at the rink, the public subscriptions be devoted to the endowment of some Institute, to be determined upon by the Committee, which will bear the name of His Royal Highness Prince Albert Victor, and be a permanent Memorial of his visit to Calcutta." Your Honor and gentlemen, I am sorry to have to interrupt and mar the unanimity of this meeting. But duty compels me to lay this amendment before this meeting, so that it will not go forth in the name of the Calcutta public that we subscribe, or that we support the entertainment at the rink (hear, hear), or any entertainment of that description (Loud applause). Sir, I think there is no difference of opinion with regard to the duty which we have to perform on this occasion. I think those who are in favour of the original Resolution, and those who will vote in favour of the amendment, are all inspired by one common sentiment of admiring gratitude to the throne (loud applause) and by deep-felt loyalty to the person of Her Gracious Majesty the Queen-Empress and the members of the Royal Family (Applause). Let there be no mistake in reference to the character and scope of the amendment, or of those who will vote in favour of the amendment. The only question at issue between us is this—what is to be the form of the Memorial? What is to be the character of the reception that we propose to accord to His Royal Highness on the occasion of his visit to the capital of the British Indian Empire? It has been said—and very eloquently said—by Sir Alexander Wilson, though said somewhat out of place by him as an Englishman, that we are an Oriental people, and because we are an Oriental people, therefore, the entertainment must be of a character in keeping with our Oriental instincts (No, no). Well I am an Oriental and an Oriental of Orientals. I yield to none

in the intensity of those emotions, or in the Oriental love for display which our warm Eastern sun has kindled in our bosoms (Applause). But at the same time we have come under the influences of English civilization, we have a Western side to our character, which it will be our duty and our privilege to present to the gaze of His Royal Highness (Applause). The inheritors of the rich traditions of the East, we have come under the influences of the noblest civilization which the world has ever seen—the civilization of England, which is embodied in the throne, and represented so far as the people of India are concerned in the person of the Royal guest, who will be amongst us in the course of a few days (Applause). We are an Oriental people; but we are something better. We have come under the influence of this civilization, and, therefore, I say let us present to His Royal Highness Prince Albert Victor something which he has not seen elsewhere, neither amid the gorgeous and brilliant displays at Hyderabad, nor amid the entertainments at Mysore. Let us present to him that phase of our character, which has heen enriched, invigorated and enlarged by English civilization and English education. Of *tamasha* and displays he has seen enough and more than enough. Is it possible for Calcutta to rival the gorgeous displays of Hyderabad or of Mysore? You will have a *tamasha* and an entertainment I have not the slightest doubt, but what will be the character of that entertainment? Will it be worthy of this City? Will it be worthy of the capital of the British Indian Empire? It will not be so because of the division of opinion which exists upon the subject. We do not think an entertainment is a right thing to offer for the acceptance of the Prince. We do think that it is our duty—our highest duty on an occasion like this to present for the acceptance of His Royal Highness a Memorial, which will be a Memorial of beneficence and usefulness, (applause), and which will recall to the mind of after-generations, and will recall to the mind of the Prince himself, when he adorns the greatest throne in the

world, those hours which he had spent in India. I do think, therefore, that by every consideration of prudence, by every consideration of sentiment, by every consideration of duty, by the love that we bear to the throne, by the respect that we owe to the Royal guest who will be in our midst, and the duty that is imposed upon us to give expression to our respect—I say—it is our duty by all these considerations to raise a permanent Memorial. And, gentlemen, I suggest, though this does not form part of the amendment, that a Leper Asylum should be the character of that Memorial (Applause). I can conceive of no more worthy Memorial than that. You know that His Royal father the Prince of Wales has taken the greatest possible interest in the leper question. He is the President of the Damien Committee. In thus honouring the son we shall be honouring the royal father himself (applause), and we shall have furthered the noblest interests of humanity. I hope and trust that the large meeting which I see before me will, by their acceptance of this amendment, ratify the fact that Calcutta is an enlightened city, is a cultured city, the seat of intelligence and education, and that it will raise a Memorial which will be worthy of the great position which it occupies (Loud applause).

THE FIFTH NATIONAL CONGRESS.

At the Fifth National Congress held at Bombay (26th-30th December 1889), Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea in supporting the resolution regarding the reform and constitution of the Legislative Councils spoke as follows :—

BROTHER-DELEGATES AND LADY-DELEGATES,

I think it will be admitted on all hands that we, the supporters of the Indian National Congress, are now entering upon what may be regarded as the most important stage in the history of the Congress movement (Hear, hear). The storm of opposition by which we were so fiercely assailed a year ago has now disappeared, and has dissolved itself into those primitive elements of isolated hate and individual despair which originally gave rise to it (Loud applause). The atmosphere around us is now clearer and serener (Cheers). We are now passing from the critical into what may be called the constructive stage in the history of the Congress movement (Loud applause). And Mr. Bradlaugh's Draft Bill is at once the token, the symbol, and the herald of the new epoch which is dawning upon us (Loud cheers). I rejoice to note that you have resolved to devote your attention this time principally to this great question of the reform of the Legislative Councils. The reform of the Councils lies at the root of all other reforms (cheers). If you get that, you get everything else (Loud applause). On it depends in one sense the entire future of the country and the future of our administrative system (Hear, hear). There is nothing which we so heartily deplore, nothing which we so strongly condemn, nothing which seems to us to be in such utter conflict with the fundamental principles of political economy, the maxims

of common sense, and even the ordinary considerations of prudence and righteous administration, as the enhancement of the salt duties (Loud and prolonged cheers). Is it conceivable that if we had the slightest control over the deliberations of the Supreme Council, if the Council had even affected to be guided by the semblance of public opinion, a law of this kind could have been passed to the prejudice of the voiceless peasantry of the country? (No, no and applause). Now, I would appeal to my brother-delegates, especially those who come from Bombay (hear, hear), and I would ask them to say whether if they had the smallest representation of the wealth, the culture, and the intelligence of this great Presidency in the Supreme Legislative Council, the Mamlatdar's Bill would have been passed in the way that it was passed (Loud applause). Turning to my brother journalists (hear, hear and cheers) who are present here, I would ask them if the Official Secrets Act would have been smuggled through the Legislative Council in the way that it was done, if they had any influence over the deliberations of that body? (No, no and loud applause). Gentlemen, our Legislative Councils are so many farces (yes, yes and cheers); magnificent nonentities (loud applause); gilded shams (laughter and cheers) which may delude children (loud laughter), but cannot deceive sensible men like ourselves who have grown into the adolescence of vigorous manhood (Loud applause). India, Sir, is now changing (hear, hear), and we are changing with the times (yes, yes and loud cheers) and the new-born circumstances of modern India demand that our Legislative Councils should be adapted to our present needs and wants (Cheers). Gentlemen, you must have all read the Minute of Lord Dufferin on the expansion and reform of the Legislative Councils (Hear, hear). At that time there was no Official Secrets Act (laughter) and the Despatch was accordingly published. I wish to speak of Lord Dufferin with the utmost possible show of consideration (Laughter and applause). I remember,—very well remember—the time when my distin-

guished friend, (Mr. A. O. Hume) behind me (loud cheers) with a faltering hand and a trembling heart sketched out the faint and meagre outlines of a scheme for the reform of our Councils (Loud applause). It was a dream—the Old Man's Hope (hear, hear), but it is now about to be realized, to his great and undying glory, and the happiness of the countless millions of my own countrymen (Loud applause). The question has indeed reached a practical stage. It is no longer in the region of vague and nebulous abstractions. I mean no disrespect to the late Viceroy when I say that he was no friend of the Congress movement, and that he was not sympathetic towards the aspirations which it represents (Hear, hear and cheers). But even he, such as he was, was so influenced by the growing efflux of public opinion, that he felt himself called upon, as much in the interests of the people of this country as for the credit and good name of the English Government (hear, hear), to recommend the reform and the reconstitution of the Councils (Applause). He suggested the expansion of the Legislative Councils, and the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils, and the reconstitution of the Provincial Councils upon a partially elective basis (Hear, hear). Then came Lord Lansdowne (hear, hear), and I need hardly say that I desire to speak with the utmost possible respect and deference of the august representative of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen-Empress, our Sovereign (Loud applause). Lord Lansdowne declared from his place in the Viceregal Council that he was prepared to reform the Councils, to widen and to extend their functions (Hear, hear). But unfortunately there is a rift in the lute (Loud laughter and cheers). His Excellency is ominously silent with regard to the recognition of the elective system in the constitution of the Councils (Laughter). I desire to repeat what has been so eloquently said here on this platform by my friend, Mr. Bishan Narayen Dhar, that no reform of the Councils would be regarded as satisfactory which did not provide for a truly representative

element in their constitution (Loud applause). Nothing indeed has been done so far as we are aware, to give effect to Lord Lansdowne's declaration (hear, hear) or to the recommendations of Lord Dufferin. All Governments, whether Liberal or Conservative, are slow to move in the path of reform (Laughter). "Quieta non movere" is their motto. (Laughter and cheers). They will let things alone (Laughter). They will not move except under the irresistible pressure of public opinion (Loud applause). If our Government will not move, we can at any rate do so (Hear, hear and loud applause). Our champion on this platform (cheers) has already taken the first step in this direction by his draft-Bill (Loud cheers). The most important question that we have now to consider is undoubtedly that of the electorate (Hear, hear). What is to be the constituency? What is to be the body that should return our members to the Legislative Councils? Direct representation is altogether out of the question, however much we may wish it; and claims that we may urge in this direction would be considered inadmissible by the British public. We must, therefore, turn to our local bodies, our Municipal and District Boards, or we must adopt the suggestion of an electoral college (hear, hear) which has been put forward by the Madras Ceommittee (Cheers). In this connection I cannot help referring to the onslaught that has been made upon municipalities in general by my friend, Mr. Norton. I cannot join him in those strictures (Laughter). Mr. Norton has no faith in municipal institutions, although he is a distinguished ornament of one of the greatest municipalities in the Indian Empire (Laughter and loud applause). I have myself been now for fifteen years a Municipal Commissioner—pardon me for this personal reference—and have come to have some faith in municipal institutions. As far as Bengal is concerned, local self-government has in the whole been a success (yes, yes and applause), and if we say that it has not been so, we cut away the ground from underneath our feet. If we have not been successful in the matter of local self-government we

have no right to aspire to higher political privileges (Hear, hear and cheers). But there can be no doubt that the local bodies, taken by themselves, would afford a constituency that would be extremely limited in its character. Even in Bengal some of the most distinguished men, of whom we are justly proud, are not members of our municipalities (hear, hear), and would have no chance of being returned as members to the Legislative Councils, if the municipalities alone were to form the constituency. My friend behind me, Mr. W. C. Bonerjee, (loud applause), my friend opposite, Mr. Anand Mohun Bose (cheers), and Babu Kali Churn Banurji (loud cheers) are not connected with any municipality (hear, hear); and yet I am sure no Legislative Council would be complete without them (No, no, it won't). The local bodies thus forming limited constituency, we must look elsewhere for a suitable electorate; and the process that has been suggested is the formation of an intermediate body—an Electoral College for the purpose of electing members to the Legislative Councils (Hear, hear). The electors, in the first instance, are to elect the members of the College, who in their turn are to return members to the Council. Thus by a process of what may be called double distillation, we provide a suitable machinery at once independent and popular, for the election of members to the Councils.

Such is our scheme, and such are our proposals. And we commend them to the care of our friend on the platform (hear, hear)—the champion of Indian interests in the House of Commons (Loud and prolonged cheers). We wish him "God-speed" in his noble work for the good of India (Loud applause). The prayers of a nation attend him to his Western home (Loud cheers). Illustrious, indeed, is the muster-roll of those great Englishmen who, having consecrated their lives to the cause of India, have won an undying place in the grateful recollections of our people (Loud and prolonged cheers.) Fawcett and Bright are dead and gone (cheers) but their names are embalmed in our memories (loud cheers), and will be

bequeathed as pious legacies to after-generations (Loud and continued applause). And, sir, if I am permitted to take a glance into the future (hear, hear) and to anticipate the verdict of history, this I will say with confidence—that in the coming times no English name will occupy a higher, a worthier, a more affectionate place in our grateful recollections than that of Charles Bradlaugh (Loud cheers that continued for some minutes). We have great confidence in him (Applause). We have great confidence in the justice and generosity of the English people (loud cheers), and above all we rely with abounding faith upon the liberty-loving instincts of the greatest representative assembly in the world (cheers), the palladium of English liberty, the sanctuary of the free and the brave—the British House of Commons (Loud and prolonged applause). When before such an assembly our prayer is pressed by such a man (cheers), there can come but one response which, I am confident, will be in accord with the great traditions of the English people and will serve to consolidate the foundations of British rule in India and to broadbase it upon the affections of a happy, prosperous, and contented people. (Deafening applause which continued for several minutes.)

THE CONGRESS FUND.

The following speech was delivered by Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea at the Fifth National Congress Meeting held at Bombay in December, 1889.

BROTHER-DELEGATES,

I rise to move a Resolution about a purely formal matter which affects the constitution of the Congress, and the arrangements which it will be necessary for us to make, consequent

upon certain changes which are likely to take place in the course of the year. I will place this Resolution at once before you, and I am sure it will be carried with acclamation. It is a sort of omnibus resolution in its own way (Here reads the Resolution). It will not require many words from me to recommend this Resolution to your unanimous, I was going to say enthusiastic, acceptance. The first part of it refers to the fixing of the number of delegates, and I think it is important that the number should now be definitely limited. We have already shown what we can do in respect of organisation. Abundantly clear too is the life and vitality animating the whole Congress movement (Cheers). In the first year of the Congress there were 70 members present in Bombay, next year the number came up to 400 in Calcutta; in Madras the number again doubled itself to 800; at Allahabad the number rose to 1,200; and in this fifth year of the National Congress we have more than 2,000 delegates present (Cheers). If this state of things were to be allowed to go on the largest hall which we can erect would not accommodate the delegates, who would be thronging from all parts of the Empire (Cheers). We have shown our capacity and our powers of organisation. The vitality of the movement is manifest, and now I think it is time that we should so organise the Congress that it will be available for the practical purposes of deliberation and business. And therefore it has been resolved, wisely resolved, I think, to fix the number at one thousand (Cheers). Then we have the appointment of the Joint General Secretary in the person of my distinguished friend behind me (Cheers). Mr. Hume is going to England. What for? Not for pleasure, not for enjoyment, not for recreation, and not for the purpose even of recruiting his health (Loud cheers): he goes as the trusted leader of the Congress movement (Loud cheers) to guide and instruct the deputation that will accompany him to England. You have done your part upon Indian platforms, you have done your work in this country, and now you must

appeal to the instincts of the English nation, not merely through the voice of the English friends who are always ready and willing to assist us, but through your own countrymen who will plead your cause in English Halls and upon English platforms (Cheers). I think this will be the realization of one of the grandest ideals that ever flashed across the mind of a patriot or a philanthrophist (Cheers); India standing before the bar of English public opinion, and there through her own accredited delegates, chosen by the representatives of the nation in this august assembly, pleading her cause, demanding the redress of her grievances—no finer, no nobler, no grander spectacle has ever been presented to the gaze of mankind (Deafening cheers). Rome, Greece, the greatest nations of the earth, have nothing to show to equal this spectacle in magnitude, in solemnity, in majestic grandeur (Loud cheers). Next comes the question of our Indian Political Agency. It cannot be doubted that this Agency has rendered the most memorable service to the people of this country (Loud cheers). If there is at the present moment an awakening of interest in the minds of Englishmen in reference to Indian matters, it is due to the indefatigable labours of that Agency controlled and guided by our distinguished Chairman and his colleagues (Cheers). It is therefore our duty to support the Agency. It is not enough to vote thanks—that we can do easily enough; it is necessary that we should follow this vote of gratitude to the English gentlemen who have been enlisting themselves in our cause by a substantial mark of our interest (Cheers). You are therefore called upon to pay—very little indeed, considering the magnitude of the work and the vastness of the Indian population. I call upon you to pay according to the measure of your ability and the measure of your self-sacrifice. You are two hundred milions of people. If every individual member of that vast population were to pay but one pice you would have thirty laks of rupees to send in. Can we not all pay a pice (Yes, Yes). Are we so wanting

in the capacity for self-sacrifice as to be incapable of a paltry effort of this kind? Yes, we may so organize the Congress that it may be possible to reach the humblest cottager and demand of him his contribution in aid of this grand national movement (Cheers). It is not right that from year to year your distinguished Secretary should pay ten or fifteen thousand rupees out of his own pocket. I think it scarcely creditable to the patriotism of my countrymen that this should be repeated from year to year. I therefore hope and trust that from this time there will be no difficulty whatever in raising the necessary contributions for the support of the Indian Political Agency. I would make an earnest appeal to you in this connection. Gentlemen, we must learn the lesson of self-sacrifice. It is not enough to make long speeches, to pass fine resolutions in this Congress; we must learn to sacrifice ourselves for the good of the country and in furtherance of the great cause to which we have consecrated ourselves. England paid twenty million pounds for the enfranchisement of Negro slaves. Will you not pay fifty thousand rupees, not for the emancipation of foreign slaves but for your own political redemption? (Loud cheers). If you are not able to do that, then I must say that the National Congress is a meaningless demonstration which cannot lead to those great results that have been expected of it. But I have confidence in you, confidence in your patriotism, and in your genuine regard for your country's interests. I would earnestly appeal to you to raise the necessary funds, and then only will the National Congress have justified its existence and fulfilled the noble mission which belongs to it in the history of the political regeneration of this vast continent (Loud and continued cheering).

THE MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT.

A public meeting of the Rate-payers of Calcutta was held at the Town Hall, on Monday the 17th March 1890, under the presidency of Moharaja Sir Narendra Krishna Bahadoor, K.C.I.E., for the purpose of protesting against the present rate of Municipal Assessment of residential houses in Calcutta and other grievances caused by the working of the New Municipal Act. Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea in supporting the First Resolution spoke as follows :—

GENTLEMEN,

I have very great pleasure in supporting this Resolution. I think we ought to congratulate the citizens of Calcutta on having at last resolved in this open, this formal and emphatic manner to protest against some of the most mischievous provisions of the Calcutta Municipal Act (Loud Applause). While this Act—it was a Bill at that time—was still on the Legislative anvil, while it was making its way slowly and painfully through the Bengal Legislative Council, we protested in this hall, we protested with all the emphasis that we could command, with all the unanimity of sentiment that we could muster; but we protested in vain. Ours is the voice of people crying in the wilderness. Who listens to those who have no part or share in the government of their own country (Applause)? I know not how long this state of things will continue. It is not given to us to pry into the mysteries of the future and the unseen. God grant that the day may dawn upon this country when Indian public opinion will be a recognized factor in the councils of the Empire (Applause), and when it will be potent enough to determine the course of administration and to check the conduct of the rulers of the land. It will depend very much

upon our own efforts, but those efforts are now being made with enthusiasm and presistency, and I hope that ere long they will be crowned with complete and triumphant success (Loud Applause). Sir, this resolution asks this meeting to place on record its emphatic protest against the provisions of a law which is opposed to the ordinary law of the land. It is a departure from the good old rule which fixes the assessment with reference to the annual lettable value of houses, which makes no difference whatsoever between residential houses and houses let out for hire. Now it may naturally be asked—and I am perfectly sure that the question will be asked not only by myself but by others who will follow me—what was the reason, assigned for this change, what was the necessity for this departure? The august mover of the Bill—he is very august personally, because he was able to have his way in the Bengal Council in spite of the strenuous opposition of the non-official element—was pleased to state that native residential houses were under-assessed. That was the statement he made before the Bengal Legislative Council. Now, mark gentlemen, it is remarkable that this statement should never have been made before the Commissioners in those numerous meetings which have been held in this hall to discuss Municipal matters. If it was really a fact that, under the old rule, native residential houses were under-assessed, why was complaint not made earlier, because in that case we could have put it to the test and to the proof? It was an *ipse dixit* statement made upon the authority of the Chairman before the Bengal Legislative Council, who were not in a position to test its accuracy, and upon this "baseless fabric of a vision"—(Applause) this law has been passed. But, gentlemen, in the midst of our confusion—I was going to say in the midst of our uproar—we are reminded of the principles of political economy (Laughter), and the great and illustrious name of John Stuart Mill has been quoted. Gentlemen, I have no objection to those principles, either for the purpose of quotation, or for the purpose of

practical application. But when those principles are flung into our teeth—when they are made the basis of additional burdens upon the people—then we have a right to demand that those principles shall be rigidly, strictly, and, I was going to say, righteously enforced and applied. I protest against the partial, the one-sided, application of political principles (Hear, hear), which are applied only when they add to the burden of our taxation, but are discarded when they tend to afford commensurate relief. ("Shame") I am not making a random statement. I am prepared to quote chapter and verse. Sir Henry Harrison, in those remarkable utterances which he made use of in the Bengal Legislative Council, was pleased to quote Mill, and it is quite true that Mill does say that, as far as the assessment of residential houses is concerned, the assessment should be fixed with reference to the cost of construction, because he considers the house-tax as a sort of income-tax. But then he qualifies the remark in a very important manner, and to that qualification I desire to draw the attention of this meeting. He says:—"The assessment ought to be at the rate of the current interest upon Government Securities." Applying that principle to our case, the assessment would be *four* and not five per cent.; and that makes an appreciable difference (Applause). He makes another very important remark, and to that remark I desire to call the attention of this great gathering of middle class men as well as of the richer portion of our community. He says that "houses under a certain valuation must not be taxed at all, must be exempted from all taxes" (Loud Applause) upon the principle of political economy, upon which the whole of that science might be said to rest, that the necessaries of subsistence must never be taxed. Now, I ask, is there any class of houses in the town of Calcutta which are not taxed? Is there any provision in the law to that effect? Certainly not. Then, Sir, are we to understand that the principles of political economy are to be applied to us when they add to the burden of our taxation,

but that they are to be scattered to the four corners of the wind when they tend to lighten the burden of taxation? In all conscience there is very great poverty in the town. Take from the rich man what is due, but do not rob him, for to be rich is not a crime. Do not deprive the poor clerk, the poor labourer, the poor peasant, the poor husbandman, of that relief which under your own accepted principles he is entitled to receive. In their name, on their behalf, for the sake of these voiceless people, I desire to ask this great gathering to enter its most cordial and emphatic protest against the provisons of Section 122 of the new Municipal Act (Applause). But, gentlemen, that is not all. The law has been so worded as to involve an infraction of the principle of local self-government. The principle of local self-government is embodied in the Calcutta Municipality; it is the noblest expression of that grand and that lofty principle for which we are indebted to the honoured name of Lord Ripon (Applause). Well now, I say in connection with the subsidiary sections, that a subsidiary clause to to section 122 has been introduced which takes away from your accredited representatives a right which they have hitherto possessed. Gentlemen, formerly all assessments connected with house property were heard by—whom do you think? Your accredited representatives. Sir Henry Harrison, by one of those dexterous movements with which he is very familiar when it suits him (Laughter and Applause), withdrew this right from the Commissioners, and he has placed that right in the Calcutta Small Cause Court. What for? Have the Commissioners ever been found wanting in their duty? Has there ever been a charge of partiality brought against us as a body, or as individuals? What reason was there for changing the law in this direction? I presume there was a shrewd suspicion that if this Draconian Code—for such it is—were to be enforced in all its rigour against the unfortunate people of Calcutta, their representatives would not sit quiet under that law but would introduce into it, and temper it with, that Divine quality which belongs to the

Most High, which is justice combined with mercy (Applause). That was the suspicion, and, therefore, I believe, he thought it necessary to withdraw this power from the Commissioners altogether. Therefore, in connection with this subject, you see we have an infraction of the right of local self-government. But the resolution makes another statement of a very important character. The resolution says that it is opposed to the principle and maxims of English law. A distinguished Indian lawyer who will follow me—my friend Mr. Lalmohun Ghose—will, I believe, be able to throw very considerable light upon the subject. I am no lawyer and my knowledge of the law is very limited indeed; but then I can appeal to great legal authorities, and you will find that they join with us in protesting against the provisions of this section. Sir Richard Garth, in a recent case, said that "the principle of rating on which the Commissioners are directed to proceed is the same as that which is adopted in England (Mind you, that is the former principle of rating) and a similar difficulty arises in the case of gentlemen's parks and mansions which are laid out for residential purposes and not for sale or letting out, such properties are nevertheless constantly rated upon the basis of their annual letting value." That was the dictum of Sir Richard Garth in a well-known case, and Mr. Justice Wilson in the same way said: "But the whole system of taxation and assessment under the act in question is obviously borrowed in its details from the English Rating Acts." And now we have an Act which makes a departure from the English Rating Acts upon the broad principles of political economy! I think we were comfortable enough under the old-fashioned English laws and we are not particularly hankering after this novel principles of political economy. Gentlemen, these were the arguments which were brought forward and we protested against this Bill in this hall and elsewhere. But, then, point has been added to that protest by the very grave inconveniences and hardships which the operation of these provisions has inflicted upon the people.

Our worst anticipations have now been more than fully confirmed. Gentlemen, in Ward No. 6, this section 122 has already been applied, and I desire to lay before you a statement which shows the increase in the percentage of assessment as regards that particular Ward. It is taken from the Municipal Office, so that no one can charge us with reading before this meeting a manipulated statement drawn from our own imagination. Well, then, I find this—that in 139 houses the rate of assessment has increased from 1 to 10 per cent, mark you. In 264 houses, the rate of assessment has increased from 10 to 20 per cent. In 175 houses the rate has increased from 20 to 30 per cent. (Applause). But we have not come to the end of this long story yet. In 162 houses, the assessment has increased from 41 to 50 per cent. ("Shame"). In 80 houses it has increased from 51 to 60 per cent. In 35 houses it has increased from 71 to 80 per cent. In 37 houses it has increased from 81 to 90 per cent, and in 27 houses from 90 per cent to 100 per cent. Let us go on; there are increases to the tune of 200 per cent and more. It is a very long story, but yet I must ask you to hear out the whole of this statement. In 13 houses the increase has been from 111 to 120; in 9 houses from 121 to 130 per cent; in 5 houses from 141 to 150 per cent. Altogether, there has been an increase in the case of 1,177 houses. In 12 cases the increase in percentage has been 250: in two cases from 241 to 250; and in several cases from 231 to 240. Now, the sum total of this statement is thus summarized.—"We find that, out of a sum total of 2,018 houses, there are 853 houses, in which the assessment has been raised from 1 to 50 per cent: there are 249 premises in which the assessment has been raised from 50 to 100 per cent; and there are 80 houses in which the assessment has risen from 100 to 200 per cent. The entire increase has been from Rs. 5,54,866 to Rs. 6,81,319; while there are pending cases which under the old assessments stood at Rs. 19,198, and which under the new assessment have been raised to

Rs. 30,697. There will thus be a further increase. In round numbers, we may take it that in Ward 6 the increase in the assessments will be from five lakhs and-a-half to seven lakhs if not more" (cries of shame). Well now, Sir, if a thing of this kind had taken place anywhere in the strongest Government under the strongest ministry in England, what do you think would have been the consequences (A Voice: "The beginning of the end") Yes, it would have been the beginning of the end, and the end would have come quickly enough (Applause). The question is—what are we to do? This statement applies to Ward No. 6; but the sword of Damocles hangs over the whole town. Ward after ward will be taken in hand and will be subjected to this fearful operation, and I am glad that you have met here this night in such large numbers for the purpose of protesting against the provisions of this section. I hope you will go up to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor with a strong petition. I hope you will go up to His Excellency the Viceroy, and I hope and trust that your patriotic efforts in this direction will not cease there, but that you will appeal before that august tribunal, the great power of English public opinion, if necessary (Applause). And, gentlemen, if that appeal should be made during the short time that I am to be in that country, depend upon it that my advocacy and my services shall be freely and unreservedly given in your cause (Loud Applause). The English people ought to be told how this law has been passed in the teeth of your protests, in the teeth of your remonstrances, and how grievous is the burden of taxation which this new law imposes and how powerless are your representatives to protect you against that burden of taxation (Applause). When that statement is made, when that story is told, there will be but one answer, a deep response from the great heart of the English people. England will not permit a law of this kind to remain on the Statute Book, which is opposed to the interests and is inconsistent with the wishes of the great interests which it

affects. That will be the answer to your appeal, and I hope and trust you will make that appeal, because then and then only are you likely to achieve triumph in the agitation which you have set on foot (Loud Applause).

ENTERTAINMENT AT THE BELLEVUE HOTEL.

On the night previous to his departure to England, Baboo Surendra Nath Banerjea was entertained at dinner in the Bellevue Hotel by his friends. Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee acted as Chairman and proposed Baboo Surendra Nath Banerjea's health who in response to it spoke as follows:—

MR. PRESIDENT AND FRIENDS,

I thank you, Sir, from the bottom of my heart for the great honour you have done me by proposing my health, and the kind words you have used in that connection, and I thank you friends for the kindly manner in which you have received the toast. I cannot indeed persuade myself to think that I deserve all that the President has been pleased to say of me. I am more willing to ascribe it to the partiality of friendship than to any merit of my own. It shall be my high endeavour in future, as it has been in the past, to merit your approbation. It would ill become one in my position, as one who is about to put on his armour, to use the confident language which belongs to him who having won his fight is about to lay it aside. It would be premature of me to speak of my work in England. I have not even arrived on the scene of operation. I have an imperfect acquaintance with the difficulties of my task. I know not who will be my opponents, what will be the weapons which they will put into requisition, whether they will be the poisoned darts of the assassin, or the legitimate instruments of a legitimate warfare. But I do know and feel this,

that feeble as the advocate may be, great is the cause which he has the honor to represent, and that the claims for justice and liberty on the part of 250,000,000 human beings must appeal with irresistible effect to the deepest instincts of the English people. And further, this I will say, so far as I myself am concerned, that if earnest work, unflinching devotion, deep and burning convictions, a faith as undying as ever found a lodgment in the breast of man, can contribute aught to the success of a movement, they shall be freely and unreservedly placed at your service and the service of my country. Supported by your prayers, encouraged by your blessings, elevated by the consciousness that I am about to be engaged in one of the noblest duties that can devolve upon man, I may flatter myself that success may still be ours. And there are circumstances which encourage and confirm me in this hope. The stupendous success of the Congress of last year, the unique and culminating point of that Congress, when in response to our appeal for Rs. 45,000, a sum of Rs. 60,000 was subscribed on the spot, and last, though not least, the ovation which was accorded to Mr. Bradlaugh, spontaneous, and coming deep from the fountains of the national heart, have all contributed to awaken a degree of interest in England in regard to Indian matters, such as had never before been witnessed in the history of our connection with that country; and as the outcome of it, we have Lord Cross's Bill for the reform of the Indian Legislative Councils. Of that Bill it is impossible to speak except under a sense of grave disappointment. Mr. Hume referring to that said we had cried for bread and a stone was flung at our face. If many are not prepared to go so far, this at any rate will be admitted, it falls infinitely short of the expectations which we had formed, having regard to the recommendations of Lord Dufferin's despatch. Lord Cross's Bill ignores the necessity of recognising the representative element in the constitution of the Councils; although we have been

crying ourselves hoarse upon the matter for several years past, even before the birth of the Congress. Lord Salisbury has recourse to the most extraordinary arguments in support of this feature of the Bill. Evidently the Prime Minister has not been able to get over his prejudices with reference to Eastern races, of which there was such a conspicuous and painful display in connection with the "black man" incident. He says the Eastern peoples are unfit for the elective system and he cites the cases of Crete, Turkey, and Egypt.

To use a lawyer's, but very expressive term, the Prime Minister is estopped from using an argument of this kind. Gentlemen, in his forgetfulness, it is most surprising that he has allowed it to escape his memory that so far back as 1858, when Mr. Benjamin Disraeli, leader of the House of Commons drafted a Bill for the constitution of the Government of India, he actually recommended that the Indian Council should be constituted upon an elective basis—half the members being elected. That recommendation was made thirty years ago, in respect of the highest Council in the Empire, by the greatest Conservative statesman of this age; and now a Conservative statesman after the lapse of thirty years refuses to make a similar concession in respect of subordinate Councils! The comparison is by no means creditable to those who would play the high *role* of being the authors of a Reform Act for India. It is far too late in the day to object to the elective system as a factor in the administration of Indian affairs. It is recognised in our system of local self-government, which according to the highest official authorities, has on the whole, been successful. Nor is the all. Lord Salisbury seems to forget the fact that we, the people of India, belong to the Aryan stock from which the English people themselves are derived. And we may remind his lordship in this connection of the memorable words of Lord Mayo, when introducing local self-government into India, he said, self-governing institutions form an essential feature in the civilization of the Aryan races. Our village

communities and our punchyets are as old as the hills, and are graven deep on the instincts of our race. To say that we are unfit for the elective system is to imply the gravest reflection on British rule. It also implies an ignorance of Indian affairs, and the history of India, an ignorance all the more culpable in the case of a Prime Minister, who has been Secretary of State for India for many years. It comes to this, that after a century of British rule and contact with the civilising influences of the West, we who had self-governing institutions established in our midst for centuries, have become so degraded that we are unequal to the practice of the principles of self-government. Surely Lord Salisbury is not prepared to accept a conclusion so unwelcome to the national sentiment of the English people and so inconsistent with truth. But I have no fear with regard to the future of this Bill. I am confident that in its passage through the House of Commons the elective system will be recognised. The Liberal and Radical members are resolved to help us in this matter. But we must help ourselves too. God helps those who help themselves. Then again, Lord Salisbury said in the course of the discussion on the Bill, that if the elective principle were once granted, it would be impossible to withdraw it. I quite admit the justice of this remark. It is a pleasing feature of English rule in India which all of us thankfully notice, that when once an advance has been definitely made, it is impossible to withdraw from it. But why should there be any necessity for doing so in the present case? Has it ever been found necessary in the whole course of British administration in India to rescind a right or a privilege which has once been conferred? High education, freedom of the Press and local self-government, were all the spontaneous gifts of the British Government. They were conferred, unasked and unsolicited. Has Government ever had occasion to regret these concessions? There was a temporary movement backward in Lord Lytton's time. But the position was soon recovered. And

now both the Indian peoples and English statesmen like Lord Dufferin, Lord Northbrook, Lord Kimberley, Lord Ripon and others press for the concession of representative institutions, and we are met with all sorts of imaginary difficulties by statesmen who ought to know better. Let the experiment be cautiously tried, and its immense superiority will be proved. The immutable law of the survival of the fittest will once again assert itself. We all no doubt cordially join Lord Granville in the remark that the Government incurs a heavy responsibility in rejecting the recommendations of Lord Dufferin. I trust the Government will not be permitted to have their own way in this matter. At any rate we members of the National Congress ought to make a determined effort. No grander opportunity for the reform of Indian Government had ever presented itself within living memory, and if we sleep over this opportunity, we are lost and deservedly so. I quite agree with the remark of our distinguished chairman, that we are living in a critical stage in the history of our country which shall make or mar for an indefinite period the fortunes of our race. I know not what is hidden in the depths of the future. It is not given to us to pry into the mysteries of the unseen. But we owe it to ourselves to do our best on this occasion, to rise to the height of our duty and to appreciate the solemnity of the situation. And if after all we fail in our high endeavour, we shall at least have the consolation and solace of leaving to our children and our children's children, an example that will cheer and stimulate them in moments of doubt and despondency—which will be to them a priceless possession and a sacred legacy, the memory of which they will not willingly let die. I will not detain you any longer. Once again, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for your goodness to-night. May your prayers support me in the work which will be mine far away during the next few months.

CONGRESS CAMPAIGN IN BRITAIN.

THE MEETING IN FINSBURY.

The first of a series of public meetings convened under the auspices of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, in furtherance of the movement for a reform on a partially elective basis of the nominated Councils in India, was held in the Forresters' Hall, Clerkenwell Road, on Monday, April 14th. There was a very good attendance, and the chair was taken by Sir William Wedderburn, Bart. Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea on being called upon to address the meeting spoke as follows:—

SIR WM. WEDDERBURN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

I appear before you, commissioned by the Indian National Congress to lay our grievances and to appeal to you for redress. I confess that I feel myself unequal to the magnitude of the task, and the greatness of the trust which has been reposed in me, but I am supported and encouraged by the conviction which is deep in me, that feeble as the advocate may be, great is the cause which he has the honour to represent—(Cheers)—and that the claims for liberty and justice on the part of two hundred millions of human beings, whose destinies an all-wise Providence has entrusted to your care, cannot but appeal with irresistible force to the deepest instincts of the English people. I have read in a book, held divine by you, which affords consolation and comfort to the millions of your people, a book which is one of the noblest that adorn the literature of mankind, that, "Righteousness exalteth a Nation." I have read your history—read it with profit and delight, and if there is one lesson more than another which it enforces, if there is one truth more than

another which shines forth in lines of light from every page of that brilliant record, it is again the grand old scriptural text, "Righteousness exalteth a nation" (Cheers). I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, extend to us in relation to the government of your Indian Empire that righteousness which has made you what you are, to enforce the fulfilments of solemn promises—(Hear, hear)—the redemption of sacred pledges, which have been uttered in your name and on your behalf by the Parliament of this country, and by the ruling authorities of India—

PLEDGES AND PROMISES,

which I regret to say, up to this moment

REMAIN INADEQUATELY REDEEMED,

and, I ask you, finally—and this forms the most important part of my appeal to you—to extend to us in part, at least, those representative institutions, which have followed in the path of English power and civilization, and which, wherever they have been established, have inaugurated a new era of peace, prosperity, and happiness to the peoples concerned (Cheers). It is with some measure of confidence that I appeal to you in respect to this matter, for you have already done the people of India the great honour of nominating one of the most distinguished of our countrymen as your Liberal candidate for representation in Parliament (Cheers). Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has won for himself, by his devoted public services extending through the period of a life-time, the esteem, the confidence, and the admiration of all classes of the Indian community, and he has set before us, the men of a younger generation, an ideal, a lofty ideal, of public duty which it is impossible for us ever to hope to attain to. I only trust that you may lead him to victory—(cheers)—and that it will be possible for him primarily to serve his constituents, and, in the next place, to serve the voiceless and unrepresented millions of India (Cheers). Ladies and gentlemen,

ENGLAND HAS DONE GREAT THINGS FOR MANKIND.

Unique is the record of her achievements not only in war and in diplomacy, but also in those higher spheres of human activity with which we are accustomed to associate the advancement of human civilization. Brilliant as this record is, permit me to say, and I am entitled to speak with authority upon a matter of this kind coming from the East, that its character is fully sustained by the nature of her Indian work. To have found a great nation sunk in the depths of superstition, to have raised them to a higher level of civilization, to have communicated to them the breath of a new life—the pulsations of a new civilization are titles to glory all her own. There was indeed a time when India was the cradle of civilization, the home of learning and of the arts; we look back upon the times even now with feelings of pride and affection. Long before the name and fame of Rome had been heard of, before Alexander had marched his armies to the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates, while Babylon was yet in the height of her glory and her prosperity, our fathers had cultivated a language and had developed a system of morals and a system of religion, which, whatever we may think of them now by the light of more advanced views on these subjects, still continue to excite the attention and to elicit the admiration of the civilized world (Cheers). Those days are past and gone, centuries of mis-government and of the domination of a priestly order to which, fortunately or unfortunately, I have the honor to belong, have produced their legitimate consequences. It was at a time of supreme national humiliation and misery, when our native governments were fast falling to pieces, when even the elements of social order were threatened with destruction, that England came to our rescue, not indeed through motives of philanthropy but impelled by the love of gain and the lust of conquest (Cheers). Nevertheless England has done a great deal for India but

MUCH MORE YET REMAINS TO BE DONE

(Hear, hear). Under English auspices we enjoy the blessings of peace and orderly government (Hear, hear). England has conferred upon us the inestimable boon of higher English education, the priceless gift of a free press and the right of free discussion. Our Universities are turning out year by year, thousands of graduates and under-graduates, men steeped in the literature of the West, steeped in your political philosophy and your political principles. Having become instructed in European knowledge they are craving for European institutions; and having lived for so long under these influences not only has a great change taken place in the outward and the material circumstances of the country, but

A VISIBLE NATIONAL AWAKENING IS TO BE SEEN ON ALL SIDES

(Hear, hear). A silent revolution has been effected, a bloodless revolution indeed, but one which is unequalled in the annals of mankind, except by what is to be seen in your own history when the seeds of the Reformation were transplanted into this country and sown upon English soil. Such a consummation so noble, so creditable to the English nation had indeed been anticipated by those illustrious men who had founded the English Empire, those great men, the grand old men of a former epoch of whom I fear you have only one left, who realized not only the glories but also the responsibilities of Imperial sway. Macaulay, to whom reference has already been made by the Chairman, speaking on the occasion of the enactment of the Charter Act of 1837, used language which reading it at this distance of time by the light of accomplished facts seems to me, as I am sure it will seem to you, to have about it the ring of prophetic inspiration. He said, "It may be that the public mind of India may so expand under our system as to outgrow that system; that our subjects being brought up under good government may develop a capacity for better government, that being instructed in

European knowledge they may crave for European institutions. I know not whether such a day will ever come; but when it does come it will be the proudest day in English history . . . . ." This consummation so devoutly, so eagerly looked for, has now been accomplished, and it is our earnest hope and prayer as I trust it will be your deliberate resolve, that those who are in charge of the Government of India and who are responsible to you for that Government, will so administer its affairs as to be worthy of this historical occasion and of the duty which devolves upon them on such an occasion. Ladies and gentlemen, this change—in fact it is the ground-work of the demand which I am about to submit to you—has been so far-reaching, so vast, so significant in many ways, as to have even attracted the attention of a class of men who are not very alive to considerations of this nature. Our officials—and I desire to speak of them with the utmost possible respect—as a rule have

NO EYE, NO INSTINCT, FOR THE PERCEPTION OF THOSE CHANGES,

which take place deep in the inner strata of society. But it so happens that in our case there has been a fortunate exception, and Sir Auckland Colvin, Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces, was so impressed by the character and significance of this change that he felt himself called upon to use the pregnant phraseology of the Bible in describing it. In a pamphlet that he wrote in 1884, he said, "The dry bones in the open valley have become instinct with life," and he went on to ask, "Are we alone to remain stationary while all things else are moving forward in India? Are we not to adapt the genius of our constitution to the genius of the altered time?" That is the question which he asks, and that is the question which I desire to put to you, and may the response come deep from your hearts, and may it be such as will be in accordance with the noble instincts of the English people and the great traditions of English rule

(Applause). Ladies and gentlemen, the Indian National Congress, which has sent me here, is the highest expression and the noblest embodiment of this spirit of reform, this spirit of change which is manifesting itself in Indian society. In the words of a great Indian statesman, it is the "soundest triumph of British Government." It seems to me marvellous that Englishmen should be found who view with suspicion and distrust a movement of this nature. I hope there are no such Englishmen at any rate in this Kingdom, but I fear there are a good many in India. We have, however, no misgivings whatsoever with regard to the attitude of the British public with reference to this grand national movement. The other day a discussion took place with reference to this matter in the House of Lords, and it is with a sense of gratitude that I refer to the sympathetic utterances of men like Lord Northbrook, Lord Kimberley, and Lord Ripon with regard to the Congress movement (Cheers). But I have even a higher authority than these. Mr. Gladstone—(cheers)—in a speech which he delivered at Lime-house some time the year before last, in referring to the National Congress, used language which at the present moment seems to be ringing in my ears. He said: "It is not right, it is not proper, that we should treat with contempt or even with indifference.

THE RISING ASPIRATIONS OF THIS GREAT PEOPLE."

Such is the language of the greatest of living statesmen—(cheers ,—and I am prefectly convinced that it represents the voice of the great body of the English people. Ladies and gentlemen, you may naturally ask me, what is this National Congress? Well, the Congress is a great gathering of delegates, which takes place once a year, about Christmas time, in some Indian capital, for the discussion of political questions and the settlement of a common political programme. The delegates are duly elected in the same way as I venture to think, your members of Parliament are elected: they are elected by constituencies in the various divisions of the

Empire. It is computed that about three millions of the Indian population took part in the election of the delegates of the National Congress who attended at Bombay last year ("No, No"). I hear a dissentient voice; I should be glad if the gentleman who protests would be good enough to state his facts and figures which contradict this view—figures which I have the honour to lay before this meeting. For his edification, for the edification of all concerned, and for the information of the British public, I once again re-affirm the proposition which elicited that dissent, that no less than

THREE MILLIONS OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE TOOK PART IN THE ELECTION

of the delegates last year,—(cheers),—and the delegates thus elected as faithfully represent the views of those by whom they are returned as your members of the House of Commons reflect the sentiments and the ideas of their constituents. Yet there are men who tell us that we are unfit for representative government and for the elective system ("Shame!"). We would point to this organization of the Congress and tell them this: Here is this vast, this stupendous, this colossal organization, with its thousands of members, with its branches and ramifications, extending from one part of the Empire to the other, all constituted upon a representative basis, and is it open to the Indian Government after that to say that their Legislative Councils are not capable of a similar treatment? (Cheers) Well, the National Congress is an institution of recent growth, but I know of no movement in connection with modern India which exhibits greater vitality or a greater measure of strength, and a greater capacity for growth than this infant institution. Let me take you for a minute or two over the facts of the case. The first National Congress was held in Bombay in 1885, and the number of delegates present was only seventy; the second Congress was held in Calcutta, in the following year, and what do you think was the number of delegates present? Not

seventy, but six times seventy, the number being four hundred and thirty-six. The third National Congress was held in Madras, and the number attending was over six hundred; the fourth National Congress was held in Allahabad and, in spite of the opposition of the local officials, the number went up to between twelve and thirteen hundred, while last year at the Congress held at Bombay, the numbers were nearly two thousand. And, gentlemen, in this connection there is an incident to which I desire to call your attention. On the last day of the meeting of the National Congress, we had placed before that body a resolution containing an appeal for funds to the extent of £4,000, and what do you think was the response which this appeal elicited? Instead of £4,000, £6,000, were subscribed in half an hour's time—(cheers),—and £1,000 was paid down on the spot. And yet we have the veracious correspondent of a leading journal of this metropolis who has the effrontery to assure the British public that a movement which has behind it so much earnestness and so much enthusiasm, which is based upon the eternal and unchangeable principles of justice and liberty, was about to collapse. Much more likely that leading journals would collapse—(cheers)—than such beneficent organizations for the promotion of human good. Ladies and gentlemen, you may possibly want to know from me what it is we want; what is the question to which above all others we assign the foremost place—what is the chief plank in our platform? I think I shall best discharge my duty by telling you in a few brief concise terms

WHAT IT IS WE DO NOT WANT,

because we have been credited with a great many things for which we do not deserve credit. Our trade-mark has been put upon a number of articles which really do not belong to us (Laughter). Let me say at once very distinctly and very emphatically, on my own behalf and on behalf of the Indian National Congress, on behalf of the educated community

throughout India, that

WE DO NOT WISH TO SEE INSTALLED IN OUR MIDST ANYTHING LIKE A DEMOCRATIC FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

We do not think India is ripe for it yet; nor do we want Home Rule, though if we did I am sure a great many Englishmen would sympathise with us (Hear, hear). We want something even much less than an English House of Commons, and therefore with the assurance of absolute confidence we appeal to the generous sympathies and the warm support of all sections, and all classes of the English community, Liberals and Conservatives, Whigs and Tories, whatever may be the character and the complexion of their political faith. We take our stand upon one of those maxims which you have taught us—"No taxation without representation" (Cheers). And we press for the reform of the Legislative Councils which impose the taxes and make the laws. Our Councils are absolute, utter, unqualified, unmitigated shams. I use very strong language; I use it advisedly and deliberately with a full sense of the responsibility I incur. I say once again that our Councils are absolute shams. The members are all nominated by the Government. Not one of them owes his seat to the suffrages of the people, or to the confidence or esteem of his fellow countrymen. Not one of them has the right to ask a single question of the Executive Government with reference to any matter of finance or with reference to any matter of administration, foreign or domestic. Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you what would you think if your Parliament, if all the members thereof were nominees of the Crown passed under the seal of the Lord Chancellor of England, if they were shorn of all their useful and varied functions; if there was no opposition worth the name, if their debates were of a formal and academic character; if their conclusions were foregone conclusions which did not even serve to test the strength of the rival parties? Our members are indebted for their seats to the Government, and they look forward to

their re-nomination by the Government. I ask: Is it possible for men thus constituted to say anything which would be in opposition to the views and the opinions of the Executive Government? It is not in human nature to rise to such heights of self-denial, and our Councillors after all are human beings. They are not angels, emanations of the all-beauteous mind. The result is that laws are passed which would never be passed in any other country, except under strong protest and remonstrance. Therefore, it is that we press for this reform. Let me give you one illustration in order to point out

THE ABSOLUTELY WORTHLESS CHARACTER OF THE LEGISLATIVE BODIES.

You know we have to pay a heavy salt-tax; I do not suppose you pay anything of the kind here. It would be the same thing as if a heavy tax on meat were imposed by your Government. I am sure you would resent it very strongly. Well, we pay something like two thousand per cent as a tax on the cost of the manufacture of salt, and this is paid not only by the rich but also by the poor, millions of whom have only one meal a day, according to the authority of Sir William Hunter ("Shame!"). Well, now not long ago it became necessary to obtain some money. The Government of India was in one of those chronic fits of bankruptcy which are the normal condition of the Indian Government. They wanted money, and the proposal was to raise the salt tax. What do you think was done? The proposal was laid before the Council, and a scene was witnessed which would have been impossible in any other country, in any other legislative Government. A valiant knight from Bombay, now a worthy banonet was the first to offer his felicitations to the Government for having proposed a measure which served to cut down the scanty and miserable subsistence of the poor man, and an equally chivalrous Rajah from the suburbs of Calcutta followed suit. Not a single word of warning, not a single voice of protest, barring the feeble notes of a Mohammedan Councillor was raised in that Council against a

provision which, in any other country, or under any other Government would have been impossible. Now

WE DESIRE TO RE-MODEL AND REFORM THIS COUNCIL.

We say that half the members of the Council should be elected, the other half to be nominated by the Government, the President also being a member of the Government, the Government, you will see, will have a majority in any case. But what does Lord Cross say with reference to this matter? He says, "No, the elective element is not to be introduced into the Legislative Councils of India." Further we ask that the right of interpellation, the right of asking questions of the Executive Government, should be conferred upon members of Council. Lord Cross says, in the Bill which he has introduced, "That right is conceded, but it is to be so whittled down that you will have only a semblance or a shadow of the real thing. No resolutions will be permitted upon official replies." Lastly, we want that the Budget should be discussed in Council. Even here,

WHAT IS CONFERRED WITH ONE HAND IS TAKEN AWAY WITH THE OTHER,

because no motions are to be permitted upon the countless items included in the Budget. Well, I must say that I have read with very great interest the debate in the House of Lords in connection with this Bill, though I declare my inability to follow some of the arguments which have been adduced. I wish to speak with the utmost possible respect of Lord Salisbury, the Prime Minister, but I fear, having read that debate very carefully, that Lord Salisbury has not yet been able to overcome that racial prejudice of which there was such a conspicuous display in connection with the "black man" incident (Cheers). My friend, "the black man," is on this platform—(cheers)—and I hope he will pardon me for this passing reference to an incident in his political career which he can now afford to forget and forgive. Lord Salisbury says that the Eastern races are unfit for the elective system, and he instances the cases of Greece, Egypt, and of Turkey.

But as far as the people of India are concerned, this argument has been adduced somewhat late in the day, for

OUR ENTIRE SYSTEM OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IS BASED UPON THE ELECTIVE SYSTEM,

and that system has been pronounced to be a conspicuous success. It is because we have been so successful in reference to the elective system in regard to our local matters that we ask you to extend it to the wider concerns of the Provinces and of the Empire. But Lord Salisbury is a little bit of an ethnologist: we are of the East, we are of Eastern lineage, and therefore the elective system is not suited to us. I desire to point out that though we come from the East, yet we are sprung from the same stock from which you are derived—(cheers).—the Indo-Aryan branch of the human family. We are, in fact, your distant kinsmen, and Lord Mayo in one of those admirable speeches which he made on the occasion of the introduction of local self-government in 1868 and 1869 remarked that self-governing institutions form an essential feature of the civilisation of the Aryan. Indeed our Punchyat system and our village communities are as old as the hills, and are graven deep on the instincts of our race. But suppose what Lord Salisbury says were to be accepted as conclusive: does not the fact imply a very grievous reflection upon British rule? It comes to this—that we, the descendants of the ancient Aryans, inheriting by our blood-relationship the instinctive traditions of self-government, have become so degraded by contact with English people that, after a century of British rule, we have become unfit for this small effort in the art of self-government. I am sure Lord Salisbury will not accept a position so unwelcome to the national sentiment and one so inconsistent with truth. It is well that we should remind Conservative statesmen of a little fact which they are apt to forget. In the year 1858 Mr. Disraeli was called upon to draft a Bill for the constitution of the House of Commons, and he actually proposed that the Council of

the Secretary of State, the highest Council in connection with the Indian Empire, should be

CONSTITUTED UPON A REPRESENTATIVE BASIS,

and that half the members should be elected (cheers) and now, after a lapse of thirty years, after the lifetime of a generation has passed, after great changes have taken place in India, Conservative statesmen are unwilling to apply Mr. Disraeli's principle to Councils subordinate to those to which he himself was prepared to extend it. Am I to understand that Conservative statesmen have forgotten the noble traditions consecrated by the name and fame of the most illustrious Conservative statesman of his generation; or have they forgotten those nobler principles embalmed in that remarkable document which we regard as the Magna Charta of our rights and privileges, the Proclamation of the Queen which was issued by a Conservative Government and embodied the views of a Conservative Ministry. But ladies and gentlemen, I have no fear. From Conservatives and from Liberals alike we appeal to the ruling democracy of England. We have great

CONFIDENCE IN THE JUSTICE AND THE GENEROSITY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.

We have abounding faith in the liberty-loving instincts of the greatest representative assembly in the world—the British House of Commons, the mother of Parliaments, where sits enthroned the newly-enfranchised democracy of these islands. To whatever party you belong, Liberals or Conservatives, Whigs or Tories, you all owe an indefeasible allegiance to that which forms the key-stone of your constitution, the representative principle, the right of the people to have a voice in the government of their own country (Cheers). Your history is the history of the growth, the progress and the triumph of the representative principle; your literature is pervaded by the same lofty spirit of freedom. Wherever Englishmen have gathered together, wherever they have formed their colonies—whether it be amid the blazing heat of

the equatorial regions, or in those distant continents watered by the Southern seas—wherever Englishmen have raised their flag and have formed their governments they have formed them upon

THE REPRESENTATIVE MODEL AND THE REPRESENTATIVE BASIS.

We are not of English lineage, or of English blood, but we have been nurtured upon the strong food of constitutional freedom. You have taught us to admire the political philosophy of Burke; the eloquence and genius of Fox, Pitt, and Sheridan. We have been brought face to face, and in contact with the struggles and the triumphs of your Puritan fathers. We have read, with great admiration, the stately and triumphant march of constitutional freedom, culminating in the revolution of 1688 (Cheers). And you must take us to be something less than human, you must deprive us of that warm sensibility of our Eastern natures, if you think that after having lived under these influences and imbibed these impressions, we were not fired with a lofty ambition and a noble enthusiasm to transplant into our own country the spirit of those free institutions which have made you what you are (Cheers). We ask, are you prepared to stifle in our breasts those ambitions and those aspirations which you have kindled in them,—are you prepared to extinguish in us that noble ardour for freedom and free institutions, which is of English origin, and has on it the impress of its English parentage? Ladies and gentlemen, you have raised for yourselves a mighty Empire in the East—an Empire which has been won by the valour of your soldiers, and the statesmanship of your administrators. But there is an Empire, nobler far than that, an Empire which is graven deep on the affections, the gratitude, and the contentment of a great and prosperous people. I ask you to aspire to this imperial sway in India, which will be worthy of a great and Christian people, and which will throw in the shade your proudest achievements in history. Let me say, once

again, before I sit down, that I plead for my voiceless country-men; I plead for liberty and justice, and if these words have any import, any weight, any signification among a Christian people, I am sure I shall not have pleaded in vain—I am sure your best efforts will be put forth on behalf of those vast and multitudinous races of the East, of whose well-being you are responsible to Providence, and who

KNOW NO HIGHER TRIBUNAL THAN THE TRIBUNAL OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.

Ladies and gentlemen, lead them along the path of progress which you have sketched out for them. Confer upon them the inestimable boon of representative institutions. Discharge your duty to India, the noblest duty that ever fell to the lot of any nation, Christian or heathen, ancient or modern, and then you will not only have performed a great national duty, which yet remains unfulfilled, but you will have consolidated the foundations of British rule, and placed it broadbased upon the affection, the gratitude, the contentment of a vast and multitudinous people (Loud and long continued cheering).

THE MEETING AT NORTHAMPTON.

On Wednesday evening, April 16th, Northampton Town Hall was the scene of a most enthusiastic and impressive demonstration in favour of Reform for India. The great room was well filled, the ladies' gallery was crowded, and the platform was packed. The Chairman was the President of the Liberal and Radical Association, Councillor Thomas Purser. Supporting him on the right were Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, M.P., and Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B, (General Secretary of the India National Congress); whilst on his left were Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, B.A., Delegate from the Congress, and Sir William

Wedderburn, Bart, (formerly Chief Secretary of the Bombay Government and President of the Session of the Congress held in 1889). Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea received a royal welcome. On the initiative of Mr. Bradlaugh, three ringing English cheers were given him in tremendous volume. His speech was a grandly impressive piece of oratory of the highest order, and was a rich treat to the listeners, who applauded with vigour at every possible opportunity.

Mr. Banerjea acknowledged the magnificence of the reception accorded him. In his individual capacity as representative of the millions of his fellow-countrymen in India, he could only express the hope that the strong feeling of sympathy and interest which they had shown in respect to the Congress movement, and which their illustrious member had shown in respect to the appeal with regard to Legislative Councils in India, would be re-echoed throughout the length and breadth of the British Islands (Cheers). He esteemed it a great privilege to be permitted to take part in the proceedings of that meeting, for Northampton was to the people of India a place of very great interest, as he trusted it would be a place of historic importance in their annals. Northampton's junior member, Mr. Bradlaugh, was the member for all India, and had behind him, besides his constituents in Northampton, 250,000,000 of India's population. Great as might be the respect Northampton might feel for him, it could not exceed that felt for him by the

PEOPLE OF INDIA.

Illustrious as were the names of those Englishmen who had devoted their services to India, in coming times he ventured to think that no English name would occupy a higher, a worthier, or a more honoured place than the name of Charles Bradlaugh (enthusiastic Applause). But deeply as he thanked them for the great concession they had made in allowing their representative to undertake work on behalf of India, looking at the

matter from the highest standpoint of national obligation and national responsibility, he could only say they had done no more than was their duty (loud cheers). Whoever might be India's governors or administrators, they, the electors of Great Britain and Ireland, were the real rulers of India. To them the destinies of 200,000,000 of human beings had been entrusted, for good or for evil—for good, as he believed it (Cheers). It was with some measure of surprise, and he was going to say some little painful surprise, that he had noticed the apathy and the want of knowledge which too often prevails in England with regard to Indian matters. Was the need of Parliamentary justice to Ireland a reason why justice should be deferred in the case of India? (Loud cries of "No"). It was not, and he was sure that would not be the answer they would give to the appeal of the unrepresented millions of his countrymen (Cheers). Unfortunately at the present time

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

was left to do pretty much as it liked, and it had hardly any sense of the responsibility which could be brought home to it (Applause). Mr. Banerjea then went somewhat into detail as to the policy which had been pursued in India. Formerly an inquiry was to be held every thirty years into Indian affairs. That inquiry had been discontinued since 1853. Promises had been made and pledges given in the name of England which to this moment remained inadequately performed and fulfilled. In 1833 it was enacted that no native of the Indian territories, or any natural-born subject residing therein, should be disqualified by reason of colour from holding office in the Government of India. In 1853 evidence in the matter came before the House of Commons, and it was shown than no native of India had been appointed within twenty years, between 1833 and 1853, to an office which he might not have held before the enactment. In 1833 the Company Directors brought a despatch to the Government of India, explaining that whatever other distinctions might exist, there should no ruling

caste, but in this year of grace, 1890, India had a ruling caste, as exclusive, as rigid, as aristocratical, as any ruling caste in any part of the habitable globe. When the Queen was made Empress, in 1858, a proclamation was issued by Her Majesty that of whatever race or creed Indian subjects might be, they should be truly and impartially admitted to all offices, the duties of which they were fully qualified to fulfil. In 1874, nearly twenty years after, Lord Lytton, then Viceroy of India, stated that those promises had been inadequately redeemed; so that from 1833 to 1853, and from 1853 to 1878 India could show an unbroken record of broken promises. ("Shame!") And at the present time have these promises been fulfilled? He could say "No." Out of nine hundred positions in

THE CIVIL SERVICE

only about twelve were given to natives of India, which meant that out of a population of 250 million human beings only twelve, bar a few High Court judges, were qualified to occupy these positions. The remedy for this state of things was to be found in the application of the same remedies which English history showed the English people had found so serviceable and so potent in the case of their own government: Giving the people a voice in the government (loud cheers), so that they had a power in the administration, and would be in a position to look after their own interests and their own grievances. This change in the Government of India had become absolutely necessary in view of the altered circumstances of the country. England had done great things for India; that he would freely admit; and among them had infused into the nations of India new-born sentiments of nationality. She had placed before them a lofty ideal of public duty and responsibility, which at the present moment was transforming the national character and imparting to the Oriental nature of the East the stability and the stamina of the West (Cheers). The changes having taken place, was it not necessary that the Government of the country should be changed and ad-

apted to the altered circumstances (Cheers)? And what was their demand? They took their stand upon the grand old English principle which the English had taught them, "No taxation without representation" (cheers), and pressed for the reform of the Legislative Councils, which imposed the taxes and made the laws. If they were to be taxed—and they were heavily taxed in all conscience, and they grumbled proportionately; for to be taxed and to grumble is

THE INDEFEASIBLE RIGHT OF A BRITISH SUBJECT

—then they ought to have something to say about the taxes to be imposed and the manner in which they were to be disbursed (Cheers). Their Councils, their Legislative Assemblies, their Parliaments—if the title might be permitted—are absolute, unmitigated shams. Their members were nominated. Not one of them owed his existence to the suffrages of the people, or had their confidence, or was esteemed by them. Not one of them had the right to put a single question on matters of finance or on administration, domestic or otherwise. He asked the audience to think for a moment what our Parliament would be if all the members were nominees of the Government? Precious little chance would there be for Mr. Bradlaugh (Laughter and applause). And, if all these members were deprived of all their authority and useful functions, what would be the result? And yet that was precisely the state of affairs in India. Members, therefore, owing their seats to the Government were not in a position to give expression to their individual opinions in face of the Government, and laws were allowed to pass which otherwise would not do so without strong protest and remonstrance. Mr. Banerjea then further proceeded by remarks on the iniquitous salt tax to show the hollow character of the present Legislative Councils and passed on to deal with another grievance—the Famine Insurance Fund, which when collected in the time of Lord Lytton out of the license tax, was promised to be "religiously" devoted to the exclusive purpose of mitigating

famines. The fund disappeared, and it was found the whole of it had been spent upon those frontier defences which were to guard the Empire against

IMAGINARY ENEMIES

(Laughter and applause). Now after the earnest and eloquent protest of Mr. Bradlaugh less than a year ago in the House of Commons, the Government had a surplus which they meant to devote to the formation of a famine insurance fund (Applause). Continuing, Mr. Banerjea spoke highly of Mr. Bradlaugh's exertion in bringing in his Indian Bill, and alluding to the Government measure, said a more unsatisfactory, more disappointing, measure he had never come across in the whole of his experience, and this was the opinion of many men of light and learning in India upon the matter. Dealing with objections raised against Indian reform, he quoted Lord Salisbury, who said that if the principle of election were once conceded it would be impossible to withdraw from the position. Mr. Banerjea said there would be no necessity for withdrawal. No single concession had ever been made to India which it had been found necessary afterwards to withdraw. Further, Lord Salisbury said that the elective system was not suited to Eastern races, and he instanced Crete, Egypt and Turkey. Lord Salisbury, said Mr. Banerjea, is a bit of an ethnologist (laughter), and it was well that he should be reminded that although the Hindus come from the East they were of the same race to which he belonged (Laughter and applause). Mr. Banerjea then showed the connection of both families with the Aryan race, and how the first practical illustration of self-government is to be found in the early Indian village communities (Cheers). He then closed with

AN IMPASSIONED PERORATION

full of expressive hope of success to the cause of justice and right on behalf of which he had so eloquently and forcibly

spoken. The close of his speech was marked with rapturous and loud continued cheering.

THE MEETING IN SOUTH LONDON.

A public meeting in furtherance of Indian Reform was held at the Horns Assembly Rooms, Kennington, on Friday, April 18th. Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., in the chair. There was a good attendance. Mr. Beaufoy, M.P., was announced as one of the speakers, but a letter of apology was read from the honourable member regretting his absence owing to serious indisposition and expressing his sympathy with the objects of the meeting. A number of gentlemen resident in South London occupied seats on the platform. Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea on being called upon to address the meeting spoke as follows :—

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

Although I have been here in London only about eight or ten days, I know something of the indulgence which is accorded by an English audience to a stranger in my position who comes in your midst to plead the cause of his country. To me it is a matter of very considerable encouragement that we have on this platform, and especially in our distinguished chairman, gentlemen, who are in strong sympathy with the movement which I have the honour to represent. Mr. Justin McCarthy, a man honoured in India for his sympathy with the cause of the weak and the oppressed, has shown his interest in the cause of Indian Reform by allowing his name to be associated with Mr Bradlaugh's Bill for the introduction of representative institutions into India (Cheers). And your

member, Mr. Beaufoy, has also, in a similar manner, expressed his interest in the same cause by consenting to support another Bill, which although it proceeds upon somewhat different lines, has precisely the same object in view, namely, the recognition of the elective element in the constitution of our Legislative Councils. Permit me now on my own behalf and on behalf of the Indian National Congress which has sent me here, to express to these gentlemen our cordial acknowledgments for their disinterested efforts in the cause of India. But I have also an appeal to make to you, the the electors of this division and through you to the electors of the United Kingdom at large. Whoever may be our governors, our administrators, our viceroys, and our lieutenant-governors, you

THE ELECTORS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM ARE THE REAL RULERS OF INDIA.

For good or for evil—for good as we firmly believe it—the destinies of two hundred millions of human beings have been entrusted to your care and to your keeping, to be discharged by you as a sacred trust for the good of India, for the glory of England, and for the furtherance of the noblest interests of civilization (Cheers). It has been to us the people of India, a matter of some little concern, and I was going to say a matter of some painful surprise, that there exists so much apathy and such a want of knowledge in this country with regard to Indian affairs; yet in spite of your devotion to the consideration of questions nearer home you cannot possibly divest yourselves of your imperial responsibility in connection with India. If you will permit me, I will in this connection relate an incident of oriental history. There lived in the eleventh century of the Christian era a very great conqueror and a very great ruler in Afghanistan : Mahmud of Ghuznee was his name. His dominions extended far and wide, and like yourselves he had conquered many countries and annexed many provinces.

One evening a somewhat elderly woman presented herself before the palace gates and claimed an audience. The audience was granted, and she was ushered into the royal presence. She came and she told Mahmud that she had come from a distant part of his dominions; and she related to him her tale of sorrow and suffering. She said that her house had been plundered, her children massacred, and her goods had been wasted. Mahmud calmly heard her story, and then said, "Woman, you live in a very distant part of my empire, and it is impossible for me to maintain order there. or to extend to it the protection of my laws." Sharply the woman replied, "Sire, why then do you conquer countries to whose interest you cannot pay sufficient attention, and for which you cannot hold yourself answerable in the day of judgment?" (Cheers) It is not for me to reply to English electors or to English Members of Parliament in the language of this woman, or to point out that

ENGLAND HAS NO BUSINESS IN INDIA UNLESS ENGLISHMEN ARE IN A POSITION TO DEVOTE MORE TIME AND ATTENTION

to the concerns of their great Indian Empire; but this I will say, that if Englishmen paid a little more attention to the concerns of the East, the administration of the vast Empire would be conducted in a manner far more satisfactory to the people, far more conducive to the honour of England, and to the furtherance of the interest of human civilization (Cheers). At the present moment the Indian Government does very much what it likes, and it is a Government in spite of the great good which England has done in the East, which to put the matter pithily, is

AGGRESSIVE AND EXPENSIVE.

The eyes of the Indian Government are fixed beyond the Indian frontiers, so that it does not see what is passing within those frontiers, and the result is that vast sums of money are spent upon works and defences for the purpose of guarding the empire against enemies, who, I venture to think, exist

only in the imagination of our rulers (Cheers). I have heard of the Russian scare since my earliest days and the Russians have not come (laughter), and, God willing, they will not come until the end of the chapter. And if they do come, if it pleases God in His providence to afflict India with such a calamity, and if India is prosperous and contented, then, let me tell you this, that they will find that behind your splendid Indian Empire there are the multitudinous

RACES AND PEOPLES OF INDIA UNITED AS ONE MAN

resolved to die in the defence of the interests of His Majesty's Empire (Loud cheers). I am not indulging in vain language of empty rhetoric. I am capable of producing facts which would establish my conclusion within the limits of mathematical demonstration. You remember the Penjdeh incident, that miserable squabble on the frontier of Afghanistan, which our military men magnified into the proportions of a veritable *casus belli*; it seemed for some little time as if these two great countries, Russia and Englands would be precipitated into the throes of a great war, which being kindled in Asia would involve two continents. God be thanked that this calamity was averted; but it brought forth into striking prominence the devotion and attachment of the Princes and peoples of India to the British connection. As soon as it became apparent that war was imminent the foremost of the Indian Princes, the Nizam, led the way and placed the resources of his country at the disposal of the British Government. Nor were the people idle and inactive. From every centre of intelligence from every centre of education from every centre of public spirit, applications were poured in upon the head of the Government in order that

THE EDUCATED COMMUNITY MIGHT BE PERMITTED TO BE ENROLLED AS CITIZEN SOLDIERS

for the defence of their hearths and their homes. I regret to have to say that these applications were never granted (Shame); I regret to have to say that even now those

applications have not been granted, and we are debarred from the privilege of bearing arms for the defence of our hearths and homes as citizen soldiers. Not so the men who have made India their temporary homes. Will you believe it that Negroes, Abyssinians, Armenians, Mullatoes, the non-descripts of every race, and climate, and nationality, who live in the back slums of our great cities, are permitted and encouraged to become volunteers, but not the Indian-born subjects of Her Gracious Majesty, men through whose veins flows pure and uncontaminated the blood of their Aryan ancestors? Such a distinction is invidious, irritating, and galling to our sense of national self-respect and national pride. I think I am not guilty of the slightest exaggeration when I say that we regard it as

A BADGE OF OUR POLITICAL SERVITUDE.

It is for you, the electors of the United Kingdom, to say whether you will permit a distinction of this kind to last much longer, whether you will not, with your voices, declare it to be humiliating and discreditable to the British rule, and to the honour of the English administration. But this is not the only irritating distinction to which I desire to call your attention. We have a Disarming Act. If a Disarming Act is thought to be necessary for the purposes of imperial safety, we have no objection. But why apply it to the Indian people; and not to Europeans and others? It is the characteristic of this Disarming Act that it applies to Indians only. I do not wish to prolong this part of my subject. I have alreay remarked that the Government is aggressive and at the same time it is expensive. At the present moment our military expenditure comes up, will you believe it, to the enormous sum of twenty millions sterling a year; that is to say

ONE FOURTH OF THE ENTIRE REVENUES OF THE INDIAN EMPIRE,

and India is one of the poorest countries in the world; it is poorer even than Turkey. It has been estimated by my friend,

Mr. Naoroji, than whom no better statistician on these questions lives, that whereas the average income per head in Turkey is £4, so far as India is concerned it is only half that amount. And yet this country, so poor, pays seventeen per cent of the national income in the shape of taxes, against your eight or nine per cent. I must say that our budgets are budgets of ever-recurring deficits, while your budgets are fortunately budgets of surpluses. From 1840 to 1888 covering a period of forty-eight years, we have had seventy millions sterling as deficits, and mark the increase in the national debt during the same period. The national debt in 1840 was under forty millions sterling, but in 1888 it had reached the sum of one hundred and sixty millions sterling exclusive of the debt incurred in the production of railways, and other kinds of public works, a further sum of £150,000,000. Some of the items of expenditure are exceedingly curious, and if you will permit me, I will lay one or two before you for your consideration. There is one item of £5,000. What do you think this item was intended for? £5,000 was paid for the purpose of bringing home Lord Lytton after his period of office had expired. I paid considerably less than £100 for coming over to this country, and I do not see why Lord Lytton should have £5,000 of our money in order that he may come from India to England (Cheers). But there is another item still more curious. I find that in one year's Budget, a sum of £30,000 has been spent out of the Indian Revenues

FOR THE COSNTRUCTION OF A LUNATIC ASYLUM AT EALING.

I cannot understand why the Indian Revenues should be charged for the cost of a lunatic asylum unless it be on the assumption, the uncharitable, but the perfectly legitimate, assumption, that some of our Anglo-Indian rulers, after their somewhat exciting lives in India may need the quiet shelter of this sanctuary to resume the even tenor of their way (Laughter). But really there is a very serious aspect to the

question. How are these evils to be remedied? What is to be the panacea? My answer is brief. Precisely the same remedy which has been found to be so serviceable and so potent in your case. Give the people of India a voice in the government of their own country; make them somewhat a power in the State, and they will be able to look after their interests and protect their rights. I wish to call your attention, for a moment or two, to the series of wholesome and beneficent reforms which have been enacted in this country since the democracy has been installed in power. After the passing of the Act of 1832, the Catholics were emancipated, the Corn Laws were repealed, the Irish Church was disestablished, the disabilities of the Jews were removed, and now that great question affecting the future government of Ireland is ripe for solution. The solution is near, the solution will come, and it will be a solution which will make Ireland, I am perfectly confident, prosperous, happy, and contented, and will add to the consolidation of the British Empire (Cheers). Well, the time has come when it has become necessary to place the Government of India more in conformity with the aspirations of the people, and the demands of the time. A great change has taken place in the circumstances of Indian life; a revolution has been effected in men's minds,

A VISIBLE NATIONAL AWAKENMENT HAS TAKEN PLACE,

our hearts are throbbing and palpitating with the new life which you have given to us, a living spark has been communicated to the dead bones of Indian life, and we are now full of that vitality which is of the West. The progress of civilization, like the progress of the sun, has been from the East to the West, and now again civilization, enlarged and added to, goes back from the West to the East. You must take into consideration the altered times, and the Government must be changed to suit the altered times. As Mr. Bradlaugh said very eloquently the day before yesterday,—"The Indians at the present moment are asking for a very moderate conces-

sion: postpone that concession for ten years, and it will be impossible for you to gratify the national aspirations with that which is asked at the present hour." Let not the words "Too late" be marked upon English policy in relation to India as unfortunately they are marked with reference to English policy in relation to Ireland. That was your great mistake in that island; do not repeat that mistake in connection with Indian administration. Well, what is it we want? My friend, Mr. Naoroji, has already explained our wants at some length. We take our stand upon the grand old principle, "No taxation without representation;"—(Cheers)—and we press for a reform of the Councils which impose the taxes and make the laws. We say that if we are to be taxed, and we are taxed heavily in all conscience, there is no mistake about it, and we grumble proportionately,—for to be taxed and to grumble is the indefeasible right of the British subject, whatever other right he may or may not possess,—we say, if we are to be taxed we must have something to say with reference to the taxes which are to be imposed, and the manner in which they are to be disbursed. That constitutes the whole of our claim. Our Councils at present are absolute shams, unmitigated, unqualified shams. The members are nominated by the Government, and naturally enough they are the creatures of the Government. We want that half the members should be elected; we want that they should have the right of asking questions of the Executive Government; and we want the Annual Budget to be discussed before these Councils. Lord Cross has introduced a Bill in connection with this matter, and of that Bill I desire to say this, that

A MORE UNSATISFACTORY MEASURE

I have not come across in the whole course of my experience as a public man. If it is intended as a sop to the Cerberus of public opinion, if the framers of the Bill hope through and by it to satisfy the cultivated intelligence and rising aspirations of my countrymen they never committed a more egregious

blunder. I have talked over the matter with a great many men of light and leading in my country, and I must tell you there is a keen sense of disapointment with regard to the provisions of the Bill. They say, instead of allaying,

IT WILL ADD TO THE INTENSITY AND BITTERNESS

of the agitation which will be continued. I cannot understand some of the arguments which have been urged against the system of election, and in support of the system of nomination. Lord Salisbury says, "To introduce the system of election would be fraught with pregnant danger, because, if once introduced it could not be withdrawn." But why withdraw it at all? Who asked you to withdraw? Why anticipate difficulties which may never occur? The English Government has been a beneficent Government to India; it has done great things for India. We have under British auspices the inestimable boon of high education, the great gift of local self-government, the priceless concession of a free press. Has the Government ever thought it necessary to withdraw these concessions? Is not England nobler, and better for these concessions having been made? Therefore, I say it is starting difficulties for which there is no occasion whatever. But, then, another objection has been urged. Lord Salisbury stated that an elective system is not suited to Eastern races, and he noticed the cases of Crete, Egypt, and Turkey. It is perfectly true that we are of the East, but then it so happens that we belong precisely to the same branch of the human family from which you have sprung: we belong to the Indo-Aryan branch of the race; and, in the words of Lord Mayo, self-governing institutions form an essential feature of the Aryan race. Permit me to point out the utterly untenable position to which Lord Salisbury is driven if we are to accept his conclusions. It comes to this, that we, the descendants of the ancient Aryans, inheriting in our blood and instincts the traditions of self-government, have become so

DEGRADED AND DEGENERATED BY CONTACT WITH ENGLISH INFLUENCES

that, after a century of British rule, we are unequal to this paltry effort in self-government! I am perfectly convinced Lord Salisbury would not accept a position so unwelcome to national sentiment and honour and so inconsistent with truth. But, I have no fear with regard to the future of this cause. We have every confidence in the justice of that great struggle in which we are at the present moment engaged—the noblest struggle which can warm the hearts or inspire the energies of men. Your history teaches that in such a struggle we can only be successful. Above all we have confidence in the sense of justice and the love of liberty of the English people. To whatever party you may belong, Liberals or Conservatives, Whigs or Tories, you all owe an undeniable allegiance to that which forms the key-stone of your constitutional system, the principle of representation, the right of the people to have a voice in the government of their country. Your history is a history of the triumph of the representation principle. Your literature is pervaded with the same lofty spirit of freedom. Wherever Englishmen have formed themselves into colonies, wherever they have raised their flag, wherever they have formed Governments they have formed them upon the elective basis. We are not Englishmen, we are of the East, but we have been nurtured upon

THE STRONG FOOD OF ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONALISM.

We have been brought face to face, and in contact with, the struggles of your Puritan fathers; we have witnessed with admiration the stately and triumphant march of constitutional freedom, culminating in the Revolution of 1688; and you must take us to be something less than human, you must deprive us of the warm sensibility of our oriental natures, if you think, that, living under these influences and having imbibed these principles, we are not fired with a lofty enthusiasm, and with a desire to transplant the glorious

spirit of your constitution into our own land. Do you wish to stifle those aspirations which you have awakened, to extinguish that noble patriotic ardour which you have raised in our minds? I am sure you do not wish to do so. You have emancipated yourselves, and I now ask you to emancipate the unrepresented millions of India, to discharge your solemn trust to them; and then you will have placed your Empire deep in the foundations of a grateful, loving, and contented people (Loud cheers).

THE MEETING AT TAUNTON.

A public meeting was held at the London Hotel Assembly-room on Monday evening (April 21st) to hear addresses from Indian gentlemen visiting England as delegates of the Indian National Congress. The chair was occupied by Mr. John Meredith, M.D. (Wellington). There was a considerable sprinkling of ladies among the audience.

BABOO SURENDRA NATH BANERJEA on rising was received with cheers. He appealed to the audience, and also as his words would go beyond these walls, to the electors of the United Kingdom, to help him in a cause with which was identified not only the happiness and prosperity of his own country, but the honour, credit, and renown of England. It was time England raised herself to the great work and responsibility she had undertaken in connection with her Indian empire. It was the noblest trust which had ever devolved upon any nation,—a mighty trust to be discharged before God and man for the benefit of India, the glory of England, and for the best interests of human civilisation (Applause). It might be said that a single elector of the United Kingdom possessed more potent influence over the Government of India than all

the 250,000,000 of his countrymen put together. The moment an elector from this country transferred himself to the tropical climate of his (the speaker's) country, he ceased to be a citizen and had no influence and no voice in the Government of the country (Hear, hear). Great as might be their power over the Government of India, their responsibility was even greater, and especially in view of the mighty changes which were developing themselves at the present moment over Indian national life. British Indian history might be divided into two epochs. One of construction and expansion of the empire and the other of consolidation. The epoch of construction had passed away. He devoutly hoped it had passed away—(hear, hear)—and the epoch of consolidation had now arrived. Those who founded the Empire and the illustrious men connected with the early government of the empire were statesmen of the highest order. They realised the great responsibility which England incurred, and from the very first planted the seeds of that civilising influence which were now bearing their legitimate fruits. English education was early introduced into India by an unknown watchmaker of London—David Hare. But he was no longer unknown. His name was deeply engraved upon their grateful recollections. Lord Macaulay once used words, which upon being read at this distance of time, in the light of accomplished facts, seemed to have about them the ring of prophetic inspiration. Speaking in 1833, Macaulay said in the house of Commons, that the "public mind of India may so expand under our system as to outgrow that system. Having been instructed in European knowledge they may crave for European institutions." This state of things, which had so eagerly been looked forward to had now arrived (Applause). A few years later the liberty of the press was extended to India as a spontaneous act of beneficence. He remembered the words used upon that occasion by the great liberator of the Press. They ran somewhat as follows: "It cannot be that we are destined by

Almighty Providence for the sole purpose of collecting taxes and revenues and making up deficits. It is our duty to extend to India the enlightenment of Western civilisation." For over fifty years they had enjoyed the inestimable boon of high education and for fifty years and more they had had the free press. The great principle of local self-government had been conceded to them by Lord Ripon, whose name would be handed down to remote generations and would be enshrined in their grateful recollections. These measures were producing their visible consequences. A national awakening was taking place. A revolution, but a silent and bloodless one, had taken place; unlike anything which had occurred in this country, except when the seeds of the Reformation were introduced from Germany and took root upon English soil. They now asked that the Government of India might be conducted upon principles more in conformity with the rising aspirations and the better education of the people. Long before the name and fame of Rome had been heard of, and before Alexander the Great had marched his armies to the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates, their fathers had cultivated a language and instituted a system of morals and religion, which even now excited the admiration of civilized nations. (Applause) What the English people had been doing was rekindling the fire of a civilization which, in ages long past, had exalted India to its high position among the nations of the earth. Now the Congress which had sent him to this country was the highest expression of the reform which had come over Indian national life; it was the soundest triumph of the British administration (Applause). The noblest work of British administration was not the battles it had won, nor the kingdoms it had subjugated, but rather that it had resuscitated into life a great and ancient people, inspired them with new-born sentiment of nationality and conferred upon them public duties and responsibilities which had transformed their national character (Applause). It so happened

that there were Englishmen who viewed with suspicion and mistrust a movement so hopeful as the National Congress, and who went so far as to accuse its members of sedition and disloyalty. Now as far as the word sedition was concerned it simply meant in his country "constitutional opposition to the constitutional Government of the country." In that sense all in the United Kingdom who were in opposition to the present Government were guilty of "sedition." They therefore need not attach too much importance to that word when they saw it used against the Indian National Congress. The speaker mentioned the names of several members of the House of Lords as being in favour of the movement, and quoted from a speech of Mr. Gladstone, in which the Liberal leader had said, "it would not do to treat with contempt or even with indifference, the rising aspirations of the Indian people." He went on to explain that the Congress was a great gathering of delegates from all parts of India, some travelling thousands of miles, and at serious inconvenience and loss of time and money, simply for the purpose of discussing political problems and settling a common political programme. The sentiment of the Congress was a faithful representation of the views of the mass of the people, for last year it might be said that as many as 5,000,000 of the people took part in the election of delegates. They had great faith in the promises of enfranchisement held out to them by their Queen-Empress, and it was the hope that their day of redemption would soon arrive that brought together their great Congress. They pressed for a reform of the legislative councils which imposed the taxes and made the laws. They said if they were to be taxed—and they were taxed heavily enough in all conscience—they must have some control over the taxation and over the disbursement of that taxation (Hear, hear). The members were all nominated by the Government and they had no right to ask a single question with reference to any matter of finance or any matter of administration, dom-

estic or foreign. The result was that laws were passed which would not be passed under any other administration or in any other country. The speaker emphasised the "salt tax" of India as a grievance, saying salt was as indispensable an article to India as meat was to this country, and the tax was levied upon a people, 40,000,000 of whom lived upon one meal per day, and half-a-million of whom had not half-an-acre of land per head. On a recent occasion when the Government wished to recover from one of those fits of bankruptcy, which was the normal condition of an Indian Government—(laughter)—they enhanced this tax upon the salt (Shame). They had no conception of the poverty of his country, and what they asked the Government to do was to reconstitute the administration, so that they might obtain relief and escape from their intolerable burden of poverty (Applause). The speaker called attention to one or two items in the Indian budget, which he described as curious in the extreme. From 1844 to 1884 the Indian budgets had shewed a steadily increasing deficit, till the amount had now reached £70,000,000 sterling. There was in India a feeling of keen disappointment that such a Bill as Lord Cross's should have been introduced under the auspices of the Government. The cardinal defect of the Bill was that it did not provide for the constitutional representation of the educated people of India. Now their Congress did not wish to assume sovereign authority over the Government of India, nor to relax the bonds of executive authority. It was their belief that the Government would be strengthened rather than weakened, by enlisting on its behalf the educated people of India. They said that half the members of the Councils should be elected by the people, to give the representative system a fair and cautious trail. The Government would still have a majority in the councils because the president would still be nominated. They had no desire to hamper the hands of the administration and actually reserved to the Government the right of veto over the majority of the

20

Council. The system of nomination had been tried for a great length of time and had failed absolutely. He would remind Conservative leaders that Lord Beaconsfield, when called upon to provide a Bill for improving the Government of India recommended that the higher council, that of the Secretary of State, be reconstructed on the representative principle. Now it seemed that the Conservatives were unwilling to carry out that which was recommended by their great statesman (Hear, hear). They had great confidence in our sense of justice and love for India, and the fact that we were firmly wedded to the right of people to have a voice in the Government of their own country. They had read our history and literature, and had been brought to a knowledge of those illustrious traditions of self-government which had made us what we were. He appealed to them as Englishmen, to extend to the unrepresented millions of India a modicum of those institutions which had made us what we were. We should then have discharged a great duty to our dependency, consolidated the foundation of our great empire, and brought gratitude and contentment to a vast multitude of people (Loud and prolonged applause).

THE MEETING AT THE ELEUSIS CLUB, CHELSEA.

On Sunday evening (20th April) Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea deliverd an address on the Indian National Congress programme to a public meeting assembled in the hall of the Eleusis Club, Chelsea. The chair was taken by Mr. W. Martin Wood, M.P.

Babu Surendra Nath, in his usual eloquent manner, claimed the sympathy of the English people as forming part of the great Aryan division of the human race to which the

Indian people belong, scouting Lord Salisbury's false analogy regarding fitness for representative government of the Bulgarians, Cretans, and Turks. He made a very apt reference to the Primrose League celebration of Lord Beaconsfield as a typical British statesman, by citing Mr. Disraeli's definite proposal in 1858 to arrange for several of the members of the Indian Council being elected by the great constituencies, thereby, as the speaker contended showing that the great man of the Conservative party regarded the principle of representation as the key-stone of our constitutional system. He also alluded to the confidence expressed in the Indian people by Lords Northbrook, Kimberley, and Ripon during the debate on Lord Cross's Bill, the shortcomings of which he criticised. He exposed the unworthy assertions of the Calcutta *Englishman* and the *Times* correspondent of the same benighted English colony, as to the Congress movement being seditious, and urged that its object and the desire of its members was to consolidate and strengthen British imperial sway, and disclaimed any wish to relax the bonds of Executive authority, as the Congress expressly desired that the vote of the Viceroy and Secretary of State should be retained. In glancing at the results of the bureaucratic system he pointed out that deficits in the years 1844 to 1884 had amounted to seventy millions sterling—nearly two millions yearly; and contended that merely nominated members could not be expected to have the courage to oppose harassing taxation, such as that on salt, or resist the ever growing extravagance of the Indian military expenditure, and the aggressive policy of the authorities of Simla and Westminster. He freely acknowledged that the good received by India from British rule far exceeded the evil that had sometimes been caused thereby; and then showed very forcibly—quoting Macaulay and other eminent statesmen—that Western education had worked its beneficent and enlightening effects, that the present generation of the Indian

people had been leavened with new life, and had acquired a high sense of public duty and responsibility. He said that although they might not at once obtain full recognition of the elective principle they were determined to persevere, and concluded with an earnest appeal to the British public to join with them in thus enlarging the basis of Imperial rule of justice and right.

THE MEETING AT PLYMOUTH GUILDHALL.

A great public meeting in furtherance of the cause of reform of India, under the auspices of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, was held on 23rd April in Plymouth Guildhall. The chair was taken by the Rev. Professor Anthony.

Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, who on rising was greeted with prolonged applause, spoke for an hour, charming the audience with frequent bursts of eloquence. He thanked them for the opportunity of addressing such a meeting on the subject that was nearest the hearts of his fellow countrymen, and which he hoped would one day become the great and burning topic of English public life (Cheers). It was his duty also to express his heart-felt acknowledgment of the eloquent terms in which the chairman had expressed their sympathy with the aspirations of the people of India. Might that sympathy ripen into an abiding interest in the concerns of that great dependency, and might the blessed contagion spread until the whole body of the electors of the United Kingdom felt that interest which they ought to feel in the well-being of 250 millions of human beings whose destinies had been placed in their hands (Applause). The time had fully come when England ought to pay some degree of atten-

tion to the affairs of her Indian Empire. The leaven planted in the midst of the Indian people some fifty years ago had now leavened the whole mass. A new India had sprung up with ideals and aspirations such as had fairly taken the breath out of their Anglo-Indian rulers. A cloud no bigger than a man's hand was visible on the horizon, and was the subject of keen speculation among the "wise men of the East."—(a laughter). They could not ignore it or despise it: they could not even afford to ridicule it. There it stood spreading over the whole firmament—a portent for good or for evil; and whether it would be the one or the other would depend very much upon the policy which the rulers of India determined to adopt (Applause). For whoever might be the governors and the administrators of India, whoever might be their viceroys or lieutenant-governors, they the people of England were the real rulers of India (Applause). For good or for evil—for good, as he ventured to think—the destinies of 250 millions of human beings had been entrusted to their care and keeping, and he hoped they would discharge the sacred trust in a way that should be for the benefit of India, the glory of England, and the furtherance of the best interests of human civilzation (Applause). It had been a matter of painful surprise, to note the apathy and want of knowledge prevalent in England in reference to Indian affairs. He reminded them that their responsibilities to India had not ended when they appointed men to rule that vast empire and left them to their own sweet wills. As a matter of fact the Government of India at the present moment was responsible to no authority. In the days of the East India Company, inquiries into the administration of the territory used to be held by committees of the House of Commons, but on the resumption of the Government of India by the Crown these inquiries came to an end. To all intents and purposes the Government of India was now an irresponsible government, and the result was that things were done which could not be

done under any form of responsible government. The eyes of the rulers of India were too often fixed on what was transpiring outside the frontiers of India, and no note was made of what was taking place within those frontiers. He had heard of the "Russian scare" since the days of his childhood. But the Russians had not yet come; and, God willing, they never would come to the end of the chapter (Cheers). And if they did, if it pleased God to afflict India with such a calamity, then let Englishmen know that behind their splendid Indian army, the multitudinous races of India, united as one man, would rise up in defence of the interests of the menaced empire (Applause). They did not want the Russians in India. They knew what they would have to expect from them. They knew, for instance, that his distinguished friend Mr. Hume and himself would be transported to Siberia—(laughter and cheers)—and they knew that all those cherished institutions which British rule had conferred—the inestimable boon of a free press, the right of free discussion, the great gift of local self-government—(cheers)—would all disappear in the twinkling of an eye—(hear, hear). No, they did not want the Russians in India. They wanted the connection with England to subsist and to grow permanent and durable. But that was possible only under one condition. The Government of the country must be liberalised—(cheers)—it must be conducted upon principles that were in accordance with national aspirations and national desires (cheers). Under those conditions he ventured to say that British rule would be permanent in India, because it would be supported not by swords and legions, but by the gratitude of a great contented, and prosperous people (Cheers). The Indian Government was an expensive and an aggressive Government. Its Budgets exhibited an ever-increasing deficit. From 1844 to 1884 seventy millions sterling represented the deficit in the Budget and the Indian debt at the present moment amounted to 342 millions! The expenditure on the army was the

most extravagant to be found anywhere. Out of a revenue of 80 millions, one quarter was devoted to armaments, and that in a country whose people were the poorest in the world. It had been estimated that the average income of the Indian people was only £2 per year, against £33 for the United Kingdom, £23 for France, and £4 for Turkey. Yet the people of India paid nearly 17 per cent of their income in the shape of taxes against the Englishman's 8 or 9 per cent. Some items in the Budget were of an extraordinary character. A sum of £100,000 was devoted to the magnificent building called Cooper's Hill College, which was never wanted and which had deprived the Indian engineers of their bread in addition to the cost of the building. Lord Lytton was paid £5,000 passage money when he returned to England—'(Shame)!'—and £30,000 was paid out of the Indian Exchequer for the construction of a lunatic asylum at Ealing—which he could only account for on the assumption that the Anglo-Indian rulers after their somewhat exciting times in India might need the quiet shelter of such sanctuaries in order to recover the even tenor of their minds (Laughter). Let them look for a moment at another aspect of Indian grievances. Pledges and promises had been made on great historical occasions under the authority of Parliament and the Sovereign, which had been either abosolutely broken or inadequately redeemed. That was a grave charge but it could be fully substantiated. The 87th section of the Charter Act, passed in 1833, provided that no native of India should be disqualified by reason of religion or place of birth, from holding office under the Company. The promise thus made to throw open the public offices to natives was broken; for in 1853 it was deposed before a Select Committee that not a single native had been appointed under the section during twenty years. In 1858, on the assumption of direct Government by the Crown, her Majesty was pleased to announce that "our subjects, whatever their race or creed, shall be

freely admitted to offices, the duties of which they are qualified to discharge by ability, education, and integrity." Thus ability, education, and integrity were to be sole tests; Lord Lytton speaking in 1874 as Chancellor of the University of Calcutta declared that the "promises of that proclamation remained inadequately redeemed." Let him come to the last instance. It was a dreary journey through this record of broken promises (Hear, hear). Take the covenanted service. Out of the 160,000 European population upwards of one thousand occupied high offices; yet out of the 250 millions of natives twelve only were supposed to be qualified. ("Shame!") What was to be the remedy for this?—(Voices: "Home Rule," and cheers). The remedy was that which had proved so effectual in the case of the English people themselves—give the people a voice in their own Government—(cheers)—make them a power in the State (cheers). A change in the system of government was specially necessary in view of the great changes which had taken place in the ideals and the aspirations of the people of India. Within the last twenty years something like a revolution had been effected in the minds of the Indian population. The India of to-day was no more like the India of Lord Ellenborough forty years ago than the England of Queen Victoria was like the England of Queen Anne (Hear, hear). Such was the declaration of an eminent authority. That is to say that India covered in forty years' time the distance that England had covered in 200 years' time (Hear, hear). That represented the magnitude of the progress and the intensity of the vitality of the movement which had been set on foot in India, and he appealed to them to recognise that movement and to give effect to it, and to adopt as their own progeny the offspring of the mightly forces they had themselves implanted (Applause). It was with great satisfaction that the people of India noted the sympathy which the National Congress had excited in England. In the House of Lords the other day the

National Congress was referred to by such men as Lords Kimberly, Northbrook, and Ripon in language for which he and his colleagues felt truly grateful. But he appealed to even a higher authority than the House of Lords. The words of that greatest statesman were still ringing in his ears. Mr. Gladstone—(great cheering)—in his speech at Limehouse, referring to the National Congress movement said:—"It will not be for us to treat with contempt or even with indifference the rising aspirations of this great people" (Cheers). But there were in India Englishmen who viewed with distrust and suspicion a movement that was so full of promise, so beneficent in its character. They went further and said that the leaders of the movement were seditious and disloyal men—(laughter, and a voice: "They always do"). They, forsooth, were seditious and disloyal men who were endeavouring to consolidate the foundations of British rule, and to broad base it on the affections of the people by removing their grievances and introducing timely reforms (Applause). But "sedition" had a peculiar meaning in India, where it meant constitutional opposition to the government of the day. Under that definition—he did not know whether the dictionary was to be enlarged—(laughter)—all English Liberals and Radicals who differed from the present Government were guilty of sedition, open or veiled (Laughter and cheers). What did the National Congress movement want? The composition of the Congress had been fully explained by Mr. Hume, and to that gentleman he desired, in the presence of an English audience, to offer an expression of the gratitude of the Indian people (Cheers). They took their stand upon the grand old English principle "No taxation without representation" (Cheers). They pressed for a reform of the Councils which imposed the taxes and made the laws, so that if they were to be taxed they should have some sort of control over the amount of taxes imposed and over the disbursement of the proceeds thereof. As Mr. Hume had so well pointed out the Legislative Councils were

utter shams—unmitigated, unqualified shams. They were merely a means of registering the decrees of an omnipotent Government. The result was that laws were passed which would never be passed in any other country. It would hardly be believed that one of the prime necessaries of life, salt, was taxed to the amount of 2,000 (two thousand) per cent. on the cost of manufacture "(Shame.) The necessity for a reform of the Councils was admitted by all responsible statesmen—Lord Cross's Bill was a proof of this. He hoped there were Conservatives as well as Liberals in that meeting. For this was no party question; it was a question of national and Imperial importance; it was a question of justice to the unrepresented millions of India (applause)—and he was sure that all classes of Englishmen whether Liberal or Conservative, were animated by a desire to do justice (applause). Lord Cross's Bill, however, was an exceedingly disappointing and unsatisfactory measure. It would satisfy no class, section, or community, but would, they were afraid, add intensity and bitterness to the agitation. The great defect of the Bill was that it did not provide for a recognition of the representative element in the Councils. Their chairman had raised the question whether or not the people of India were prepared for the extension or the partial extension of representative institutions. He maintained that they were, and in support of this position he gave a series of interesting facts relating to the working of the various local government bodies, all of which partook of the elective character in their formation. The speaker answered some of Lord Salisbury's objections to the demands of the Congress, and quoted against his lordship's views those of Mr. Disraeli, who in 1858 drafted a Bill for the better government of India, in which he advisably proposed that the highest Council in India should be constituted on a representative basis and that one-half of its members should be elected (Cheers). He hoped that the Conservative statesmen of to-day had not departed from the illustrious

tradition that had been consecrated by the name and fame of the greatest Conservative statesman of this generation (Applause.) Mr. Banerjea concluded his long and effective speech by an eloquent passage in which he appealed to the people of England to perform a great national duty by conferring on their Indian fellow-subjects the priceless boon of representative institutions, and so basing that vast empire on a secure foundation deep in the affections, the gratitude, and the contentment of its multitudinous peoples. He resumed his seat amid enthusiastic cheering.

THE MEETING IN EXETER.

A meeting, which was largely attended, was held at the Athenæum, Exeter, on Thursday evening (April 24th) to hear an address from Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, B.A., to explain the grounds upon which the Indian people are appealing to the British people for the concession of the elective principle in the Councils of India. Sir J. B. Phear, who was for several years Chief Justice of Ceylon, presided.

Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, in an eloquent speech, paid a tribute to the work which Sir John Phear did while in India, and remarked that at Calcutta one of the main thoroughfares had been called after his honoured name (Applause). The Irish problem, he said, might be pressing, as doubtless it was, but he could not admit that in consequence of that justice to India should be deferred or postponed. Great was the power of the English people, but far greater were their responsibilities. But he regretted to say that those responsibilities were not always discharged in a manner conducive to the best interests of the Indian Empire. The Government of India was practi-

cally left to itself. The Indian Budget in the British House of Commons, the only occasion when Parliamentary influence was exerted, was brought in at the fag end of the Session, and was discussed before empty benches. It was obvious that if the English Parliament or the English electors took an adequate interest in their vast Empire such a state of things would be impossible (Hear, hear). The result was that the Indian Government was left practically in an irresponsible position, and the eyes of the Indian rulers were, for the most part, fixed on what was passing beyond the Indian frontiers rather than what was passing within those frontiers. Such a policy was exceedingly short-sighted. He had heard of the Russian scare from the days of his childhood. The Russians had not come, and, God willing, they would never come to the end of the chapter. If they did come and if India was prosperous and contented and grateful, then Englishmen would have behind them a splendid Indian Army—the multitudinous races of India combined as one man, resolved to die in the defence of the Empire (Cheers). They did not want the Russians in India at all. He knew what they expected from the Russians. They knew that men like himself would be sent to Siberia for being somewhat plain-spoken, and they knew also that some of the most cherished institutions upon which the prosperity and, he was going to say, the glory of their country depended, such as, for instance, the gift of a Free Press, the right of local self-government, all this would disappear within the twinkling of an eye. And in India they knew all that, and they wanted the people of England to remain there. They wanted the connection with England to subsist, to become stronger, and perhaps to become permanent. But there was one condition on which such a connection was possible. The Government must be liberalized, must be conducted on popular principles and from national aspirations. Unfortunately that was not the case at present. Twenty-seven millions were spent upon the Indian Army, or 17 per cent of

the national income of a poor country in the shape of taxes, while England, the richest country in the world, paid eight or nine per cent. The result was that the trade was much less than it would be under more favourable auspices. He criticised several items in the Indian Budget. But it was not merely in the matter of expenditure in India which he brought as a charge against the Government. Pledges the most solemn and deliberate given on great and historical occasions by illustrious statesmen in language the most emphatic, had either been broken or inadequately redeemed. For instance, notwithstanding the clause of the Charter of 1833, preference had been shown to an undue and enormous extent to Englishmen in public offices. But he said he was not prepared to plead guilty to inferiority of intellect which such preference seemed to involve (Applause). The question was,—What was to be the remedy for these evils? His answer was brief. They knew in England the beneficent measures which they had passed since the Reform Act of 1832. It seemed to him that the time had come when the Government of India must be altered to suit the altered times and the rising aspirations of the people (Applause). A wonderful change had taken place in India. Those illustrious statesmen who were connected with the fortunes of the Indian Empire, not only realized the glories but also the responsibilities of Imperial sway. It was their earnest hope, as in Exeter he trusted it would be their deliberate resolve, that those who were entrusted with the Government of India would so administer its affairs as to make the country worthy of its historic name. He was interested in reading some of the statements, by persons who ought to know better, in connection with the Congress movement. A distinguished Anglo-Indian official living at Bath, read a paper before an assembly of his countrymen, and tried to pooh-pooh the idea of a national congress. He said there could be no such thing as a national congress, for the simple reason that there was no such thing as an Indian

nation, India being a congeries of nations. This doctor seemed to be very unfamiliar with the present state of things. He seemed to under-estimate the competency and the intensity of those forces which the English had planted in India. A common system of education, a common government, common institutions, and a common language—their own beautiful language—were fast destroying all traces of separate races and separate groups, and welding into one compact mass the hitherto discordant elements of Indian society. He (the speaker) had no misgivings with regard to the attitude of the public in connection with this movement. In the House of Lords the other day, the National Congress was referred to by such men as Lords Kimberly, Northbrook, and Ripon in language for which he and his colleagues felt truly grateful. But he appealed to even a higher authority than the House of Lords. The words of that greatest statesman were still ringing in his ears. Mr. Gladstone—(great cheering)—in his speech at Limehouse, referring to the National Congress movement, said: "It will not be for us to treat with contempt or even with indifference the rising aspirations of this great people" (Cheers). What did the National Congress movement want? The composition of the Congress had been fully explained by Mr. Hume; and to that gentleman he desired, in the presence of an English audience, to offer an expression of the gratitude of the Indian people (Cheers.) They pressed for a reform of the Councils which imposed the taxes and made the laws, so that if they were to be taxed they should have some sort of control over the amount of taxes imposed and over the disbursement of the proceeds thereof. As Mr. Hume had so well pointed out, the Legislative Councils were utter shams—unmitigated, unqualified shams. They were merely a means of registering the decrees of an omnipotent Government. The Indian people desired to make the Government of India more efficient, purer, more righteous, more noble, and therefore it was that

they desired that the Councils should be reconstituted and reformed. The necessity for reform had been admitted by several responsible statesmen who had anything to do with the Government of the country: by Lord Lansdowne, Lord Dufferin, and Lord Cross. A Bill had been introduced into Parliament in this connection. It had passed the House of Lords, and was awaiting the decision of the House of Commons. The cardinal defect of the Bill was that it made no proivision for the recognition of the representative element in the constitution of the Council. The people of India desired that the question should be treated as a non-party one. It was essentially a National and Imperial question, and one of justice to the unrepresented millions of India. Lord Salisbury did not realize the great mission which England was called upon to discharge in the history of the world. The speaker quoted as an answer to Lord Salisbury's argument, the views enunciated in 1858 by Mr. Disraeli, who drafted a Bill for the better government of India, and in it he actually recommended that the highest Council in connection with the Government of India should be reconstituted upon a representative basis, and that half the number of members should be elected (Cheers). Now, after the lapse of thirty years, was it to be understood that Conservative statesmen had forgotten those noble and illustrious traditions that had been consecrated by the name and fame of the greatest of Conservative statesmen of this generation (Applause). But the Indian people had no fear. If their rulers should find it impossible to concede to them even a small modicum of representative government, they appealed to the rising democracy of the English people, in whose sense of justice and love of liberty they had abounding confidence. To whatever party his hearers belonged they were Englishmen, and were firmly wedded to that which formed the keystone of our constitution, namely, the right of the people to be associated in the government of the country. The history

of England was the history of the growth and triumph of the representation of the people; our literature was pervaded by the same lofty spirit of freedom. The Indian people had been cultured on the strong food of English constitutional freedom; they had read our literature and our history; they had read the immortal writings of our poets and the great achievements of our national heroes; they had heard of the struggles and triumphs of our Puritan fathers; and they had read with admiration the story of the triumphant march of English constitutional freedom culminating in the Revolution of 1688; and the English people must take their Indian fellow-subjects to be less than human, they must deprive them of the warm sensibilities of their Oriental natures, if they expected that, having these impressions, they were not fired with the enthusiasm to transplant into their own country so far as the altered circumstances would permit, the spirit of that glorious constitution (Cheers). He appealed to the people of England to perform a great national duty by conferring on India the boon of representative institutions, so as to place the British Empire beyond those perils and dangers to which a military nation was exposed, and to base it deep in the affections, contentment, and gratitude of a multitudinous people (Loud cheers).

THE MEETING AT SWANSEA.

A meeting was held at the Albert-hall, Swansea, on Monday night (April 28th) for the purpose of furthering the question of Reform for India. Three prominent delegates from the Indian National Conference were advertised to address the meeting, and the Committee which had taken in hand the organisation of the gathering naturally considered that that fact would attract an overflowing

audience, and they therefore made admission by ticket. His Worship the Mayor presided.

Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea thanked the audience for the resolution they had so emphatically and enthusiastically carried. It was to him a matter of very great encouragement and support to know that this was the second meeting that had been held in connection with Indian Reform, and to know that on a previous occasion a similar resolution had been passed at Swansea. He prayed that the blessed contagion would spread far and wide, and that the United Kingdom would rise to a sense of its great responsibilities in reference to a great and unrepresented empire. It must be obvious to the most cursory observer that the history of his country had reached a critical stage both in regard to its government and its people (Hear, hear). The present method of administration had been fixed 30 years ago, and since that no reform worthy of the name had taken place. But in the meantime great changes had taken place not only in the material but in the ideal, in the feelings and aspirations of the people. In the words of a prominent Anglo-Indian official "the India of to-day is no more like the India of the time of Lord Ellenborough than the England of Victoria is like the England of Queen Anne." A Great reform had manifested itself in Indian society—a reform brought about by the beneficence of English rule. By the inestimable boon of a free press, which had been spontaneously bestowed upon them, the Indian people had become educated and they now demanded that they should have a small share in the management of their country (Hear, hear). He asked them not to permit in relation to India the mistaken policy they had followed elsewhere. Let not the words "Too late" be inscribed upon their banner (Cheers). Forty million people in India lived on one meal a day, and 70 per cent. of the two hundred and fifty millions owned less than an acre of land per head. Millions of lives had been lost through famine

during the past fifty years, and yet the Government spent upon military expenditure, twenty millions a year—one-fourth of the revenue ("Shame"). But there was one condition—the government must be liberalised, must be conducted in accordance with national wishes (Hear, hear). They could not hope to hold in political serfdom for ever the people they had so highly educated as the people of India. They were loyal now because they were educated, because they felt that British rule would do an immense deal of good to the people of India; because they believed that British rule would pave the way for the fulfilment of those hopes and aspirations which the British people had kindled in their breasts (Hear, hear). He complained bitterly of the way in which the natives were treated in the matter of official appointments, especially in the police departments, which he described as the asylum of all the incapable relatives in the Anglo-Indian service. In the civil administration there were, out of 100,000 English people, 1,000 officials, while out of 200,000,000 people only a dozen were deemed to be qualified ("Shame"). He was not prepared to plead guilty to such a charge of inferiority and incompetence as that comparative statement implied (Cheers). He had descended from a noble race, and he could not forget that when the Europeans were wallowing in their forests his forefathers had adopted a language, and developed a system of religion and of morals that had been the admiration of mankind (Cheers). The Indian people were not immoderate in their demands. They simply asked that half the councils should be elected and the other half and the president nominated; and they confidently appealed to the British people to grant them this concession (Loud cheers).

THE MEETING AT COLSTON HALL.

A meeting was held at the Colston Hall, Bristol, on 1st May in furtherance of the objects of the Indian Reform movement. The meeting was one of a series being arranged to be held throughout the kingdom by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress "on behalf of the unrepresented millions of British Indian subjects, and for the reform on a partially elective basis of the nominated councils of India." The chair was taken by Mr. Herbert Thomas.

Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, who met with an enthusiastic reception, said Bristol was a place of consecrated memory to the Indian people. Bristol was not only the home of that friend of India, Miss Mary Carpenter, but it claimed the ashes of the great founder of the Brahmo Samaj movement, the Rajah Ram Mohun Roy, who was the product of English education. Whoever were the governors or administrators of India, the people of England were the real rulers of India. He was afraid, absorbed in duties nearer home, they did not pay sufficient attention to Indian concerns. It had caused him some surprise and regret to see the apathy and want of knowledge which prevailed in that country in regard to Indian affairs. If Englishmen concerned themselves more in the administration of their vast Indian empire it would be governed upon principles more conducive to the happiness of India and of England alike. At present the Indian Government was practically irresponsible. It was true it was responsible to the Secretary of State for India, and he to Parliament, but the budget of this large empire was not introduced into Parliament until the fag end of the session, and then it came before empty benches. The Government of the country did not treat Parliament and did not treat India with fairness. There had been recently presented to Parliament mutilated papers

from which were omitted passages opposed to the views the Government entertained. There was an official despatch from Lord Dufferin. In that despatch he recommended a reconstitution of provincial councils upon a partially elective basis. Lord Cross did not desire to extend the representative franchise into the constitution of Indian councils, Imperial or provincial. Those passages in Lord Dufferin's despatch which made the recommendations regarding the elective principle were deliberately and wilfully omitted (Cries of "Shame"). He did not think that was the proper way of dealing either with the Parliament of this country or the people of India (Applause). They wished British rule to be durable, to be made permanent, but there was only one condition on which this could be—they must have liberalised government and one carried on in accordance with national wishes and aspirations. The Government of India was despotic; it had been said to be a despotism tempered by red tape. Despotism was something foreign and strange to the genius of the English Constitution, to the traditions of their rule and instincts of a noble people. English history was one long record of protest against a despotic form of government; their history was a history of the triumph of democracy over autocratic power (Cheers). He asked them as Englishmen, with this history and with this past, whether they were prepared to perpetuate a system and form of Government which they had condemned, and which they had abolished for their own country (Cries of "No"). Carlyle had said, "Injustice revenges itself with compound interest." They could not hope to keep for ever in political serfdom a people so highly educated as the people of India had been under English auspices. Changes had taken place in the circumstances of the country, in the ideas and the aspirations of the people. It had become necessary for them to change the system of Government, to introduce into it a representative principle which was prayed for, and which he was sure the

democracy of England would grant to them (Applause). The Indian Government was a very expensive Government, although the Indian people were so poor that there were forty millions of the inhabitants of India who lived upon one meal a day. The speaker went into details to show how increasingly large in some particulars was this expenditure. Another complaint which had to be made was the broken promises of English rulers. It was part of East Indian Charter that natives of India should be eligible for the appointments in that land, and in 1858, when the Queen granted the Indian Magna Charta one of its provisions was that public appointments should be "freely" open to natives who had the ability, education, and integrity. These provisions were practically set at naught; artificial barriers had prevented their application, and to enter the Civil Service in India a youth had to come to England and pass a difficult examination set for him by the English. What was the remedy for the grievances that he had to make! A simple one—one which had solved English grievances. Trust the people (Loud applause). And then they would be in a position to safeguard rights, and look after their interests (Applause). This had become all the more necessary in view of the marvellous development of public life in India in recent years. Macaulay speculated on the possibility of the time coming when English influence might lead India to aspire to English rights of government, and said that would be the proudest day for England when it arrived. That day had arrived, and he asked them on behalf of the Indian people to prove themselves worthy of that memorable period of their history. What would the English people think of a Parliament formed of nominees of Lord Salisbury (loud laughter) or anyone else? They would think of such a Parliament pretty much the same as the Indian people thought of the Parliament which was provided for them.

THE DEBATE AT THE OXFORD UNION.

Thursday, May 22nd, at 8 P.M. Question for debate "That this House views with regret the non-recognition of the elective principle in the Indian Councils Bill now before Parliament." Moved by Mr. Eardley Norton, B.A., Merton, opposed by Mr. J. F. W. Galbraith, Oriel, Secretary. The splendid debating Hall of the Oxford Union Society was well filled on Thursday, May 22nd, to hear Mr. Eardley Norton and Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, the delegates from the Indian National Congress, upon the subject of Indian Reform. There was a large and appreciative House which greeted the delegates with much enthusiasm while the visitors' gallery was crowded to over-flowing, the audience including, Mr. Norton, Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., H.R.H. Prince Kitiyakara of Siam, and Miss Cornelia Sorabji, B.A., who is now studying at Oxford. The chair was taken at eight o'clock by Mr. F. H. Coller, Christ Church, President of the Society.

Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, who met with an enthusiastic reception, said he was greatly indebted to the House for the cordial reception which had been accorded to him, and he could assure the House that that reception would be to him a source of encouragement and inspiration in the somewhat difficult task which he had undertaken that night. He craved the indulgence of the House for a few moments—he was afraid he would take some little time of the House—in discussing the numerous points which had been raised. He thought he would best discharge his duty by stating in the first place in a few plain words the situation in India, and the demand that they made in conformity with the requirements of that situation. What they said was this. The English Government had given them high English education, it had conferred

upon them the inestimable boon of a free press, and last but not least it had conceded to them the gift of local self-government based partially on the representative system (Cheers). They had now for a period of more than fifty years lived under these influences. For more than fifty years they had enjoyed these blessings, and he thought the House would think they must be something less than human, if after living under these influences and imbibing these impressions, they were not inspired with a lofty enthusiasm to transplant into their country something of the spirit of the constitution which they had learnt to adore in the noble literature and noble history that England had taught them (Cheers). They asked England and the English people to gratify those aspirations which they had kindled in their breasts, and they made that demand not only upon purely sentimental grounds—grounds of emotion, grounds of sensibility, grounds of vague, undefined feeling—but because they were distinctly of opinion that the result of such a concession would be to add sensibly and visibly to the efficiency, and he was going to say, the stability of British rule in India (Cheers). Such was the case, such were the grounds upon which their appeal was made to this House (Cheers). He was somewhat surprised at some of the statements that had been made (Laughter) by the gentleman (Lord Hugh Cecil) who had opposed the motion. He was somewhat in symathy with him in his ignorance (hear, hear);—at the same time he felt it his duty to point out to him that he was grievously mistaken in some of the statements which he made he knew not upon what authority. He thought he did no injustice in that statement (Laughter). The hon. gentleman said, in the first place, that English education was introduced into India in 1835. As a matter of fact, a Hindu College had been established in Bengal in 1817. Not only that, but he would fall back on an authority held in high esteem by the hon. gentleman himself. He would quote Macaulay. Macaulay speaking in 1853 from his place in the House of Commons on

the occasion of the enactment of the Charter Act referred to this wise step which had been taken by the Government. Let him quote the words because he had them in his memory. Macaulay said from his place in the House of Commons—Sir Robert Peel, Lord Lansdowne, and others taking part in the debate—Macaulay said, "It may be that the public mind of India may so expand under our system that it may out-grow that system, and our subjects having been brought up under good Government may develop a capacity for better Government"—and this is the most important passage—"that having been instructed in European learning, they may crave for European institutions (Cheers). I know not whether such a day will ever come, but if it does come it will be the proudest day in the annals of England" (Cheers). On the authority of Macaulay, on the authority which the hon. opposer himself claimed, he maintained that the noble day which had been so longingly looked forward to, the proudest day in the annals of England had arrived, and it was for the English people to prove themselves worthy of the occasion (cheers), and he hoped and trusted their vote to-night would be a vote which would strengthen that public opinion which was after all the moral support of all Governments (Cheers). He was somewhat amazed at some of the figures which were quoted by the gentlemen who opposed. He expected some such opposition, and he came armed with all the facts (Cheers). He was glad he had got his authorities before him. Here he would quote the figures and they would tell a tale which no amount of rhetoric would ever do. The fact was this, that at the present moment they had more than three millions of their population who attended schools and colleges. And the English people who had representative institutions in such a perfectly developed form at the present moment, and have had representative institutions of that form for a period of fifty years and more, could only put forward three millions of students in 1881. In 1881 they had full-blown representative

institutions, and they were in a position to send 670 members to the House of Commons. In India they had no representative institutions whatever, nothing even worthy the name of even elementary representative institutions, and yet their people were highly educated on the basis of these facts. Let him read a quotation from a speech of Mr. George Yule : "Since 1858 about twenty millions of pounds have been spent on educational institutions. The number of these institutions at the present time is 122,000, attended by upwards of 3,300,000 students. The number of schools in England in 1821 was only 18,467 and the scholars 650,000. These however have rapidly increased during the last twenty years, but it was not till 1881 they reached the number of the schools and scholars in India." And to go to another official authority, here is Mr. Growse, a very eminent antiquarian, who says: "My own opinion in which I am yearly more and more confirmed, is that the average of happiness, intelligence, culture, and general information is as high in an Indian as in an English village" (Cheers). He thought as far as the educational aspect of the question was concerned it might be taken for granted that they were not the barbarians they were represented to be (Cheers). The statement was made in the course of this debate that the Indians before the advent of the English were a pack of barbarians or semi-barbarians ; he believed that was the language that was used. Let him remind this House that they came—the Hindoos of India, the race to which he had the honor to belong—(loud cheers)—they came from a great and ancient stock, that at the time the ancestors of the most enlightened European nations were roaming in their native woods and forests, their fathers had founded great empires, established noble cities and cultivated a system of ethics, a system of religion, and a noble language which at the present moment excited the admiration of the civilized world (Loud cheers). They had only to walk across the way, and place themselves in the Bodleian library

to witness the ancient records of Indian industry, Indian culture, and Indian ethics; therefore it seemed to him the remark was somewhat out of place (Cheers). If the remark was made to prejudice the claim which they had now the honour to put forward, to prejudice their claim for representative institutions, never was it more misplaced, for the simple reason that self-governing institutions formed an essential feature of the civilization of the Aryan race, and they came from the Aryan stock (Cheers). The hon. opposer of the motion was pleased to refer to the authority of Sir Henry Maine in reference to certain quotation he made. He (the speaker) was prepared to bow to that authority, and accept him as an authority on Indian matters. What did he say in reference to India? The first practical illustrations of self-governing institutions were to be found in the early records of India. Their village communities were as old as the hills (Cheers). When they asked for representative institutions, or a partial concession of representative institutions, they asked for something which was in entire accord with the genius and the temper of the people of India, in entire accord with the traditions of their history, and in entire accord with the tenour of British rule in India. What had they done? As he had already remarked the British Government had conceded local self-government on an elective basis. They had a system of local self-government, based on the representative model, in Bengal, Madras, Bombay, and the North-West Provinces; the whole country was scattered broadcast with municipal institutions based on the representative model, and what was the official opinion with regard to them? They had been pronounced to be a conspicuous success (Cheers). And what they said was this, they took their stand upon the achievement that had already been made, upon the success that had already been attained—they said to the Government, "You have applied the representative principle, the elective system, to the administration of our local affairs,

and the administration of our local affairs has been pronounced to be a conspicuous success, and therefore on the basis of past experience we appeal to you to extend the elective system, the representative principle, to the wider concerns of the Provinces and the Empire at large" (Cheers). He asked that House, was it possible by any show of reason or plausibility to dislodge them from a position so logical, so consistent, so unassailable (Cheers)? They had been tried, and they had not been found wanting (Loud cheers). Therefore upon the basis of past experience they asked them to extend the representative system (Cheers). He found another misconception in the speech of the hon. opposer of this motion (Lord Hugh Cecil), in fact, the speech bristled with misconceptions. The words "democratic government" occurred at every third line of his speech. They did not want democratic government (Cheers). When they were fit for it they would come and pray for it. At the present moment they did not consider themselves qualified for democratic government, or for Home Rule, or for Parliamentary institutions. Their demands were exceedingly moderate. He had only to state them before an English audience in order to point out how exceedingly cautious they were in their proposals. At the present moment their Councils were entirely nominative. He should have something to say with reference to the sham character of these Councils by-and-by. They were entirely nominative—the members were all nominated by the Government, and they told the Government they had tried that experiment long enough; it was pronounced to be a failure from one end of the country to the other (Cheers). Even the official organs of public opinion said that, and therefore they asked to have half the members nominated, the other half to be elected. And not only that, but the President would be a Member of the Government, and therefore in these Legislative Councils the Government would always and infallibly have a majority. Not only that, they were so anxious that nothing should be

done to hamper the Government in any way or to relax the bonds of Executive authority, that they actually reserved the power of veto to the Government, so that the Government might supersede or set aside any decision arrived at by a majority of the Council. All they required in such cases was that the reasons for the supercession must be stated. Was there in this demand any approach to democratic Governments, to Home Rule, or to Parliamentary institutions? (Cheers). And was it not desirable to consider the great advances that had taken place in the circumstances of the Government and of the country, and was it not necessary that some reform of this kind should be made? (Hear, hear). He said that the English Government could not stand still where it was at the present moment (Cheers). It would be dangerous to stand still; it would be positively mischievous to fall back. There was one course of policy open to the English Government in India, namely to advance steadily, cautiously, wisely, deliberately, along the line of prudence and beneficence which had been marked out by the former policy of illustrious Anglo-Indian administrators (Cheers). They asked the Government to do this and no more. Reference had been made to their divergent religious beliefs. Had they not that in this country, might he ask? Protestants burnt Roman Catholics three hundred years ago, and the Roman Catholics paid back the compliment in the same way, and not very far from the place where they had met that night. They in India had never done that (Cheers). They occasionally had some little controversies, but nothing equal to the bitter controversies that they had had in this country. Let him relate to them an incident, if he was not trespassing on the patience of the House (cries of "Go on") to show the harmony that existed between Hindoos and Mohamedans. About two years ago there was a dispute between the Sunnies and the Shias. These were the two great sects into which the Mohamedans were divided and at a great meeting for the purpose of settling

the dispute which was held in the capital of Mohamedan influence and power, the ancient capital of Mohamedan greatness, what did they think was the outcome of their deliberations? Actually four Hindoo gentlemen were appointed for the purpose of settling the matters of dispute affecting the religious ceremonies of the Mohamedans (Cheers). He should like to know how many Protestants would appoint Roman Catholics for the purpose of settling any such differences (Hear, hear). Therefore, this religious dispute was a matter which had been vastly magnified, but only for a particular object, namely, to throw difficulties in the way of representative institutions in India (Cheers). But even if the differences were much wider, much deeper, much more bitter than what they were, he claimed upon the basis of historical facts that differences in respect of religious matters were no bar to the introduction of representative institutions. (Cheers) The Austrians and Hungarians fought with the utmost bitterness and animosity, but all their differences of opinion had been settled by the saving principle of representative Government. He took it that this was really no argument to which any great importance should be attached. Lastly, as to social questions, it was said they paid no attention to social matters, but he was sorry to say here again there was a misconception, a misreading, a misinterpretation of Indian History. The hon. gentleman who alluded to this subject seemed not to have understood that the National Congress movement was only a political manifestation of a great national upheaval, which had taken place not only in respect of politics, but also in respect of religion and social institutions. It must not be supposed that the National Congress movement represented the cackling of a number of educated Baboos or "much speaking Bengalees" to use the language of the opposer of the motion. It represented something vaster than that, something far more comprehensive, far more significant, something which was likely to produce consequences of the very greatest

importance as regarded the fortunes of the people and the Government. In consequence of those agencies to which he had referred there had been a revolution in the national mind, and it had been felt in every department of human thought, in religion, in social questions, and in politics. In politics, fortunately or unfortunately as the case might be, they moved along the line of least resistance, and therefore the intensity had been most keenly felt there; but as a matter of fact it would be a mistake to confine its bearings to the National Congress, to overlook the influences which had been felt in the departments of religious and social thought. The National Congress was supplemented by a Social Conference, and not only that, but a revival of Hindooism was going on of which they had no idea, because it was not necessary for them to write their tracts in English for the edification of the British public. They appealed to their people in their own language in order that they might be religious, but when they had to obtain political liberties they had to appeal to the English people, consequently they thought they were only politically engaged, whereas as a matter of fact they were engaged in matters of social as well as religious reform (Cheers). He wished to tell the House that they were a deeply religious people. The religious reform movement was the first in point of time, as it was the first in point of importance. Rammohan Roy was the founder of Brahmoism, the monotheistic creed of new India. Rammohan Roy was the brightest product of English education, and by a mysterious decree of fate England claimed his ashes; he lay buried at Bristol. The religious movement preceded all other movements, then followed the social movement, inaugurated by Pundit Iswara Chander Vidyasagar, and the National Congress came last, and therefore in point of logical sequence it was the last in point of importance, but as far their rulers were concerned it was the greatest. That was really the state of things. He just wished to point out to that House, before he sat down, that

this was really not a party question at all (Cheers). It was a question of national and Imperial justice. They bound themselves to no parties, they appealed for justice to all, and they had illustrious names on their side of the question belonging to both ranks of English party politics. That illustrious politican and diplomatist there—(pointing to a portrait of Lord Dufferin)—who was a President of that Union, had in a despatch recommended the recognition of the elective system in the constitution of the Legislative Councils; the House would attach very great importance to an expression of opinion coming from so illustrious a man, having behind him the weight of Indian experience (Cheers). Not only that, but another President of that Union, Sir Henry Harrison, was in favour of the elective system; and there were men, too, on the Liberal side of the House with them (Cheers). Let him refer to some names on the other side. Take, for instance, Sir Richard Temple and Sir Richard Garth, the late Chief Justice of Bengal (Cheers). Thus, therefore, the matter was one in which no party interests were concerned, which appealed to that common sense of justice and fair play, that found predominance in every English breast (Cheers). Representative institutions were a consecrated possession which in the counsels of Providence had been entrusted to the English people. He quite admitted that it was for the English people to guard that possession, to spread it, and not to make it the property of this people or that people, but the heritage of mankind at large. England was the home of representative institutions; from England as the centre, representative institutions had spread far and wide until this country had justly been called the august mother of free nations. The people of India were children of of that mother, and they claimed their birthright, they claimed to be admitted into the rights of British citizens and British fellow subjects. He was perfectly certain that such an appeal made to the English people could meet with but one response —a response of sympathy, and a readiness to grant it (Cheers).

He pleaded before that House for justice; he pleaded for liberty not inconsistent with British supremacy, but tending to consolidate its foundations and he was perfectly convinced that so long as these words, these sacred words, had any weight, any meaning, any signification amongst Englishmen and in that House, they would record, by an unanimous vote, an emphatic vote, their sympathy with their aspirations, their desire that India should be governed according to those eternal principles of justice and liberty, which were engraved deep in the hearts, the convictions, and feelings of Englishmen to whatever party, to whatever creed, to whatever sect they might belong. (Loud and prolonged cheering),

THE GARDEN PARTY AT GATESHEAD.

A large garden party assembled in the grounds of Bensham Grove, Gateshead, the residence of Dr. R. Spence Watson, on Saturday afternoon, for the purpose of meeting the representatives of the Indian National Congress, who are at present on a visit to this country with the object of setting forth the claims of the Indian people to elective representation in the Councils of their country. The weather was fine, though chilly, and an enjoyable time was spent on the pleasant tree-sheltered lawn. Afternoon tea was provided *al frasco.* The deputation consisted of two Indian and two English gentlemen, namely Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea B.A., Principal of the Ripon College at Calcutta and Editor of the *Bengalee* newspaper; Mr. Mudholkar, B.A., LL.B., Pleader of the High Court; and Mr. A. O. Hume, General Secretary of the Indian National Congress. The latter gentleman is the son of Joseph Hume the famed political economist. About two hundred ladies and gentlemen assembled

in the garden, among whom were represented almost every shade of political opinion. Among the gentlemen present were the Mayor of Newcastle (Mr. Thomas Bell), Sir Benjamin Browne, the Sheriff of Newcastle (Mr. Edward Culley), the Vicar of Newcastle (Canon Llyod), the Town Clerk of Newcastle (Mr. Hill Motum), Mr. John Philipson, Mr. James Annand, County Councillor Mr. Dodd, Councillor T. Waller, Mr. John Laidler, Mr. John Havelock, Mr. Henry Wallace, Trench Hall, Mr. W. Thornton, Principal Garnett, Mr. James Hornsby, Mr. Henry Garrick, Alderman Hindmarsh, Rev. W. Moore Ede (Rector of Gateshead), Mr. W. R. Plummer, Mr. Murray, Mr. A. Keith Durham, Councillor Beattie, Councillor Goolden, Councillor Weidner, Rev. J. Bowman, Mr. J. J. Harris, Rev. A. F. Riley, Mr. Percy Corder, Mr. R. Cameron, Sunderland, Mr. John Pattinson, Mr. E. Girling, Mr. Ralph Walker, Mr. E. MacCarthy, Mr. J. J. Gurney, Mr. Beveridge, Mr. Micheal Burns, Mr. C. G. Binks, Mr. George Luckly, Councillor Riley, Lord, Mr. F. W. Dendy, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Mansell, Mr. Whiston, Mr. Dryden, Mr. Kerss, Mr. Carr, Mr. Wilkinson, Mr. Thomson, Mr. Sinclair and others.

Some time having been spent in a sociable manner, Mr. Amers's band playing selections of music meanwhile.

Dr. WATSON, the host, said they were met together as good friends, though of all manner of opinions (Laughter). He thought every sort of opinion, political and otherwise, was represented. But they had met in honour of gentlemen in whom they were all interested—(hear, hear)—and from whom they would hear what the objects of the Indian National Congress were and what that body itself was. He took it for granted that the great majority of them were seeking for information, and it was a natural and desirable thing to do on a point of that kind. Indian questions had had too little consideration from Englishmen, and he hoped that before they became burning questions they would be able to keep them from

becoming party questions (Hear, hear). The question of India was far too great and too serious to be allowed to become a mere party question. Englishmen themselves had made every difficulty and created every desire for reform which existed in India to-day, and upon no country had so great a responsibility devolved as had devolved upon England in respect of India. We had given the people of India our own tongue, and had also conferred upon them the priceless blessings of education. This was bringing forth its own fruits. It was promoting in the people a desire for a greater interest in the affairs of their own country. A large number of the highly educated Indian people had formulated certain demands which they brought forward in a moderate, resonable and absolutely loyal spirit, and it would be a grave dereliction of duty on the part of England if she turned a deaf ear to their request (Hear, hear). Sir William Hunter had lately assured them that education was progressing by leaps and bounds in India. England had given them that education, and now the Indians asked in a simple and moderate way that those amongst them who had proved their capacity in many different fields of service should be allowed to take some fair share in the government of their country (Applause).

Mr. Hume, in discussing what the aim of the Indian National movement was, said that many years ago England laid down a form of government then extremely well suited to the infant nationality of India. Now, however, through educational advancement, they had outgrown that form of administration, and what was just and reasonable on our part fifty years ago was now tyranny and oppression. The Indian national movement existed, therefore, to moderately alter the administration to suit the changed conditions of the country. The scholars in the regular schools of India had increased from two millions to four millions during the last ten years. No nation in the world had such a record of progress in

education. That rate of progress would be maintained, and their main object was to prevent any dislocation, any cataclysm, and to model the change in the form of administration on the change in the spirit of the people (Hear, hear). He then described the constitution of the Congress, which consisted of about 1,900 gentlemen elected by about five millions of people, every religious sect in the whole of India being fairly and adequately represented. They were elected, of course, without any franchise, because they had no power to control the affairs of the country, but when the representatives did get a potential voice in their Councils then they would lay down a franchise, and a rather high franchise, because their policy was to introduce the new system gradually and in accordance with the growth of intellect and education among the people (Applause).

Mr. Banerjea said he was there to plead the cause of his country. Their programme was to say to the British Government, "You have given us education. You have conferred upon us the great boon of a free press. You have conceded to us a a system of local government based upon the representative model. For more than fifty years we have lived under these influences and enjoyed these blessings and now their fruits are manifest. You have awakened in us aspirations which we ask you to gratify" (Applause). They had no conception of the intensity and vitality of the educational movement in India. Macaulay had written of the Indian people that "having been educated to European learning, they may crave for European institutions." They held that that prophecy had come true, and that the time had now arrived when it was the duty, and should be the pride, of the English people to give effect to those noble aspirations which they had kindled in the Indian breasts. The national movement in India had its stand upon the old English principle—"No taxation without representation" (hear, hear)—and they claimed that the Legislative Councils in India should be reformed (Hear,

hear). They did not in the smallest degree desire to interfere with the Executive Councils of the country. They did not want to usurp the sovereignty of England. They did not want Home Rule. They did dot want democratic government —at any rate at present (Laughter). He supposed they would want it by-and-by (Hear, hear). They did not want Parliamentary institutions. What they wanted was that they should be allowed to elect the people whom the British Government now appointed as the spokesmen of the Indian people. Nay, to show the moderation of their proposals, they only asked that half of them should be elected and the other half should be nominated as they were now. The Bill now before parliament could not satisfy them because it did not recommend the elective principle in the constitution of their Councils. They were told that it would be dangerous to introduce representative institutions into India. That was much the same argument that was used when Canada applied. Such institutions were granted to Canada, however, with the result that there was no more loyal part of the British dominions than Canada, and he was perfectly certain that the result would be the same in India. They pleaded for liberty, not incosistent with British supremacy, and if they got what they asked for, it would tend to consolidate foundations of British rule. The English had given them the inflences he had spoken of, and if they stifled their aspirations he need not tell them what the result would be. Therefore both on the ground of self-interest and of duty they appealed with confidence to Englishmen to render them the justice to which they were entitled, and he was sure their appeal would elicit a warm response in the hearts of all true-born Britons (Applause).

Mr. Mudholkar also briefly addressed the gathering. What they wanted, he said, was that the people of the country should be associated with the government of the country, but only so far as was consistent with the maintenance of the supremacy of the English Empire. In years gone by, both Mr.

Disraeli and Lord John Russell—a Conservative and a Libera —had expressed the opinion that the principle to be followed in the government of India was one which could be carried on in consultation with the people. Thay had the authority of Lord Dufferin and Lord Lansdowne—the two latest Viceroys of India, who could not be considered as having any partiality for democratic principles—that the elective principle should be recognised in that country. Their movement being thus supported by those responsible for the government of the country they had the best authority for saying it was a loyal movement. One reason why they were so anxious for these reforms was the extraordinary poverty of the people, which necessitated the representatives of the people taking a greater interest in the affairs of the country. Military expenditure had been growing enormously. In 1857 it was 12 millions, in 1884 it had risen to 17½ millions, and now it was 20 to 21 millions. The civil expenditure had been going on in the same way, and therefore they needed that the representatives should take more interest in the country's affairs. The policy must either be progressive or retrograde. It could not stand still, and their prayer was that they should be admitted into the sacred fold of British citizenship (Applause).

Sir Benjamin Browne, in moving a vote of thanks to the deputation for their speeches, said there could be no doubt that as two countries were drawn more and more closely together their habits tended to become more and more similar, and therefore they could not be surprised that their Indian friends were wishing to become more Anglicised than hitherto.

The Rev. W. Moore Ede seconded the motion, which was heartily passed.

On the motion of Mr. Girling, the company present heartily expressed their gratitude to the host and hostess for their kindly entertainment.

The party separated about seven o'clock.

THE MEETING AT NEWCASTLE.

The delegates from the Indian National Congress who were introduced on Saturday to a representative gathering at Dr. Spence Watson's garden party in Bensham, held a public meeting on the 2nd June 1890, at Ginnett's Circus, Newcastle. The area of the building was occupied, and among those present were the Mayor and Sheriff of Newcastle, Alderman Barkas, Councillors Morton, Plummer, and Laird, Dr. Spence Watson, Principal Garnet, Mr. John Havelock, Mr. C. G. Binks, Mr. George Charlton, Mr. R. B. Duncan, and Mr. John Nixon. The Mayor (Mr. Thomas Bell, J. P.) occupied the chair.

Babu Surendranath Banerjea said he was reading in anticipation of their visit here a few days ago—(interruption by a volunteer band outside) an admirable speech delivered by his honoured and respected friend, Dr. Spence Watson, in 1888, and in that speech he observed certain remarks that were so much in sympathy with his own feelings, that he desired to place them before this meeting, and to take his stand upon the basis of those remarks. On the occasion of a garden party, similar to that held at his park on Saturday last, Dr. Spence Watson was pleased to remark that "the North was the home of free causes." So it was and their member, Mr. John Morley—(cheers)—was fighting an important battle in connection with a neighbouring country. He did not in the smallest degree desire to underestimate the importance of the Irish problem, but he did say this, that justice to Ireland was no reason why justice to his native country should be deferred (Hear, hear, and applause). He would go a step further and observe that they were a great deal worse off than the people of Ireland (Hear, hear). The Irish people had their re-

presentatives in Parliament, and they could make their voices heard and felt in the councils of this empire. They had not a single representative in the Imperial Parliament, not a single duly elected representative in their own native Councils, no voice, or part, or share in the Councils of their Government. He might have a vote in this country by reason of his being a lodger, but the moment he set his foot upon his native land, the sacred soil of his ancestors, endeared to him by a thousand ties and a thousand recollections, his vote disappeared and he sank to the position of the political helot and political serf (Shame!). They had been crying themselves hoarse with reference to this matter, they had appealed again and again to the Government of India, .but all in vain, and now they brought their case before the high court of English public opinion (applause), and they appealed to the rising democracy of these islands in the firm hope and fullest confidence, that the claims of the 250 millions of human beings, whom the decrees of an all-wise Providence had entrusted to their care, must appeal with irresistible feeling to the deepest instincts of the English people. They (the Indians) were a highly religious people and a highly emotional people. He had read in the Book which they held to be divine—one of the noblest books that adorned the literature of mankind—that "righteousness exalteth a nation." (Hear, hear). He asked us to show them that righteousness which had made us what we are. He asked them to enforce, to redeem a solemn promise and pledge given in their name by the Parliament of this country and the Sovereign of these realms, and he asked us to extend to them at least those representative institutions which had always followed in the path of English conquest and civilization and added to the prosperity and happiness of this country and humanity at large. Well, the Government of the French Republic was even more generous than the Engligh Government in regard to the enjoyment of political rights and privileges of the Indian native subjects (Hear, hear). It

might be a startling revelation, but it was none the less an absolute truth. The native inhabitants of French India were brothers, men of the same race with themselves, speaking the same language, professing the same religious beliefs, ofttimes far less cultivated and educated than those of British India. These men had the right not only to send and to elect representatives for their great Council at Pondicherry, but actually to send deputies to the Assembly that held its sittings in Paris (Applause). Now, he asked them were they less liberal, less liberty-loving, less anxious to do justice to the native inhabitants of India than the French Republic was? He was sure they were not. He was sure the facts only needed to be laid before them in order to elicit from them a strong expression of opinion with reference to this distinction, which was a slur upon the British Administration in India (Cheers). He desired from that platform to raise his warning voice, because they were all loyal subjects of the Crown and devotedly loyal to the British connection, against a possible source of difficulty, a possible source of embarrassment which might develop itself into a possible source of danger. He desired and he earnestly begged of them not to allow the words "Too Late" to be inscribed upon their policy in connection with the Indian Government. Concessions which at the present moment would please the people, conciliate, fill them with sentiments of enthusiastic gratitude, would fall flat upon them if made ten years hence. For God's sake let us not have another Ireland in India! (Cheers) If they would permit him he would venture to say this, because it was the absolute truth, that the only possible way of averting a danger of this description which might occur in the future was by wise concessions, timely made so that these concessions might have the appearance of concessions made under the impulse of generosity and a desire to deal justly with the people of India (Hear, hear, and applause). He did not think he did any injustice to the Indian Government if he said it was

practically an irresponsible Government. After referring to the suppression of the advice by Lord Dufferin in respect to representative government, the speaker proceeded to refer to the miserable condition of the natives. Forty millions were underfed, according to the statement of Sir William Hunter, late member of the Viceregal Council; 70 per cent. of the land was occupied in less than one acre per head, and millions of people had died of starvation under the British Government during famines which had broken out since 1860, while money was frittered away in frontier fortifications against an invasion which only existed in the imagination of the Government. Again, salt, a necessary of life, was taxed, and the poor man had to pay 2,000 per cent. for it above the cost of manufacture (Shame!). They had forest laws by which the poor man was deprived of the wood he might use as fuel or for the purpose of constructing himself a house, but he might go on and relate hardships of government without end. They were burdened with a terrible military expenditure. He was listening to an eloquent speech of Mr. Gladstone's the other day—(Cheers)—in connection with the Potter memorial celebration, and that grand old man—(hear, hear)—said that militarism in Europe was the vampire which sits like an incubus upon the troubled bosom of the European Continent. If that was true of Europe, it was one-hundredfold more true in respect of this country. There were twenty millions of Indian money spent upon the military service in India, one-fourth of the entire revenue. What was the justification of this enormous military expenditure? He had heard it said that it was necessary to guard the country against the prospect of Russian invasion. Well, he had heard of this Russian scare since the days of his childhood, but the Russians had never come, and, God willing, they would never come to the end of the chapter. If it pleased Providence to inflict India with such a visitation, and if India was prosperous and grateful and contented, then let him say this, they would find behind their splendid Indian

Army the multitudinous races of India, united as one man, ready to die in defence of the empire (Applause). They wanted the connection between India and England to subsist, to grow, to deepen, and, God willing, to endure for ever; but then that was possible under but one condition, namely, that the Government must be liberalised and conducted in accordance with national ideas and aspirations. Their government in India at the present moment was an unqualified and unmitigated despotism. They said it was tempered with red tape—he said it was tempered with the caprices and humours of their rulers. Despotism was opposed to the genius of their constitution, to the instincts of their people, and he asked them if they would perpetuate in India a form of government which they had condemned outright in blood and flames in the history of their own country. Remember justice was a terrible avenger; it avenged himself with compound interest. Despotism was debasing not only to the slave but ruinous to the master himself (Cheers). They had confidence in the justice of their cause, confidence in their desire to do justly by them. Wherever Englishmen had raised their flag and settled themselves, the government had always been based upon the representative model. They were not Englishmen, true, they were not men of English lineage or extraction, but they had read their literature and their history. They had read the immortal writings of their great poets, the heroic achievements of their illustrious warriors, and they would be something less than men, if they had not imbibed these influences and become inspired with enthusiasm to transplant into their country something of that noble constitution which had made this country great. Were they prepared to stifle these aspirations in their breasts? The great English heart had beaten in sympathy for the Bulgarians, the Greeks, the Poles, but they were something more, they were British citizens, their fellow-subjects, and they appealed to them by that tie which bound them and that might endure for ever, to

admit them into the rights of British citizenship and confer upon them the inestimable boon of representative institutions, with the love and gratitude of 250 million human beings, by an act of sympathy and generosity which will be the crowning glory of an imperial, and above all, of the Christian race (Loud cheers).

THE MEETING IN DUNDEE.

A public meeting in furtherance of the objects of the Indian National Congress was held in the Kinnaird Hall on 5th June, 1890. Councillor Mathewson (in the absence of Lord Provost Hunter, who was then in London) presided, and there were on the platform—Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, B.A.; Mr. R. N. Mudholkar, B.A., L.L.B.; Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., representatives of the Indian National Congress; Mr. S. A. Chalk, Assistant-Secretary, British Congress Committee; the Rev. C. M. Grant, the Rev. William Hamilton, Principal Peterson, ex-Provost Moncur, Councillor Ritchie, Mr. John Robertson of Elmslea, Mr. D. H. Saunders, Mr. Peter Matthew, and Mr. Alexander Gow.

Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, who was greeted with hearty applause, said that throughout the country they had been received with open arms. He was quite sure that in Scotland they would at least meet with the same welcome (Applause). Scotland was the home of freedom, and the mother of those Liberal ideas which had leavened the political institutions of the United Kingdom (Applause). Nay, more, speaking from the Indian point of view—which was his point of view—they had many staunch advocates of the Congress movement who had distinguished and honoured Scottish

names—names which, he was fully persuaded, would go down the stream of time, and would form grateful recollections in the breasts of generations still unborn (Applause). Before God and before man, the people of Great Britain stood pledged to the performance of great and sacred duties towards the people of India. The Government of India was despotic—it was a bureaucracy pure and simple—and they, the people of India, desired to introduce representation and representative institutions. Against their bureaucratic Government they appealed to the people of Scotland—people who had great and glorious memories behind them, and were the descendants of the Covenanters—they appealed to them to help in the struggle (Applause). Britain had given to India education. They had set before them the systems of self-government based upon a representative model. For more than fifty years they had enjoyed these blessings, and they would be something less than human if they were not now animated with the desire to introduce into their country the same privileges. Reference had been made to the poverty in India. The people of this country had absolutely no conception of the degrading, miserable, squalid poverty of the teeming millions of India. In India forty millions of the people were under-fed. They lived upon one meal a day. Then there were the dreadful famines which had been referred to. In regard to them Lord Lytton raised what was called the Famine Insurance Fund, which, however, had been misappropriated in erecting frontier defence works. Lord Lytton, representing the majesty and the glory and the sanctity and the veracity of a great Empire and a great Queen, said that that fund was to be set apart and to be devoted to the sole and exclusive purpose of mitigating the the horrors of famine. Instead of that, it was spent in frontier works. He asked them if a proceeding of that kind would have been tolerated in Great Britain? It would have raised such a storm that it would have swept the strongest Ministry

that ever existed out of power (Applause). Take, for instance, the case of the Indian policemen, and they would get an idea how the people of India lived. The Indian policeman was paid 2s. a week (Laughter). The result of such wages was that he supplemented them by taking bribes. While the policeman had his 2s. a week, what did they think the European District Superintendents had? Their salaries ranged from £300 to £1,200 a year (Cries of "Shame!"). These District Superintendents of Police were the sons or the cousins of high-placed Anglo-Indian officials, and were exempt from examinations. Recently a return of such officials showed that out of fifty-four, twenty-eight were relatives of officials. Once there was a resolution passed that these Superintendents would have to pass an examination. At the time the declaration was made known, forty had enrolled their names, but immediately afterwards it dwindled to fifteen. On the day of examination, the number had further decreased to eleven, and out of the eleven who were bold enough to go forward, four passed. Some of the unsuccessful gentlemen got one, two, and three marks in the examination for the English language, the language of their birth. Such would have been the accredited guardians of the lives and the property of the people of India (Applause). In addition to the enormous salaries attached to the officials, the country was burdened with a vast military expenditure. The justification for that was that Russia would make an attack on India. If, however, it pleased Providence to afflict them with such a visitation, and if India were prosperous, grateful, and contented, then, let him say we should find behind our splendid Indian army the people of India united as one man ready to die in defence of a menaced Empire (Applause). They did not want the Russians in India, for they knew what that would mean. The people of India desired Britain to remain where she was, and would have the union between the two countries made closer. To secure this closer union was to liberalise and

conduct the government of the former in accordance with national ideas and national aspirations. Britain had given India liberty, freedom of the press, freedom of discussion, and they knew that the moment the Russian Cossack set his foot upon their sacred soil the spirit of liberty would take wings and disappear. All their liberties would disappear in the twinkling of an eye. That was why they did not want Russia to be there. They wanted the friendship between themselves to grow, to deepen, and God willing, to be permanent and enduring for ever. The Viceroy of India, who ruled over the poorest country in the world, by the irony of fate, was the most highly paid official, he receiving £20,000 a year. They took their stand upon the grand old British principle— No taxation, no representation. Their programme was really but a small one. They did not want Democratic or Home Rule institutions, although when the time came they would likely ask for these too (Applause). Out of the great population in India there were in reality only about one dozen natives who were deemed qualified to hold important appointments. For himself, he was not prepared to plead inferiority in respect of intellectual or moral worth. He could not forget that he belonged to a great and an ancient race. The blood of his Aryan sires flowed through his veins. He remembered their past achievements away back to the nebulous times of human civilization, and though they had become degraded, and although they had fallen from the ideals of the past, still the race to which he belonged was one of which any man or any nation or any country would be proud. They appealed with confidence to British citizens, knowing that when Britain had granted their request they would have placed the Empire upon a foundation that could never be dislodged, which would guard it against the dangers and perils to which military Empires were exposed; while 250 millions of devoted people would guard an Empire, consecrated by love, ennobled by duty, and sanctified by justice (Loud Applause).

THE MEETING IN ALBERT HALL, ABERDEEN.

On 7th June 1890, a public meeting was held in the Albert Hall, Aberdeen, at which addresses were given on the question of Indian reform by a number of Indian delegates. Professor Minto occupied the chair.

Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, who was loudly applauded, said he had the honour of being one of the pupils who sat at the feet of Mr. Hunter, the member for North-Aberdeen (Applause). He knew of no truer or more devoted friend of the people of India than Mr. Hunter (applause), and they would rely upon him and also upon Mr. Bryce (applause) for their advocacy of the claims of the people of India in the debate approaching in connection with Lord Cross's Indian Bill. As Mr. Bryce recently remarked in a lecture he gave in Aberdeen, Aberdonians had a peculiar and special interest in India, for a great many Aberdonians had taken part in the administration of India, and what was still more important and more significant, had taken a part in the development of the resources of India (Applause). It was therefore with some measure of confidence that the delegates appealed to Aberdonians—to their sympathies and, what was more, to their sense of duty (applause), to render them the justice which they claimed at their hands, and to which they believed they were thoroughly entitled. (Applause). A single elector of the United Kingdom had more potent influence on the Government of India than the 250 millions of his countrymen put together. He might be a voter in this country by reason of being a householder or by reason of being a lodger, but the moment he set his foot upon his native land his vote disappeared, and he sank into the position of a political serf. Their government was despotism—unqualified and unmitigated despo-

tism (applause and hisses) and they were seeking to introduce the leaven of representative institutions into the Government. They had cried themselves hoarse upon the matter, they had appealed to the Government of India, and they had appealed in vain, and now they brought their appeal before the high court of British public opinion (applause) and they appealed to the democracy of these islands for justice and redress (Applause, and a voice—"You will get it"). He was sure they would get it; and he was sure all they had to do was to explain their position to state the facts—"naught extenuate, or aught set down in malice"—but give a clear and unvarnished account of the whole of their sorrows and sufferings, and he was sure one response would come from the great British heart—an unalterable desire to render them justice, to render them liberty, to render them the dues they were entitled to (Loud applause). He desired to raise the warning voice against a possible danger, a possible source of embarrassment and of difficulty—he warned them not to repeat in connection with the government of their Indian Empire those blunders which they had committed in respect of the government of a neighbouring country (Loud applause and hisses). He asked them not to allow the words "too late" to be inscribed upon British policy in India. Concessions which at the present moment would please the people, would conciliate them, and win their lasting enthusiasm and gratitude, would fall flat upon them if made ten years hence. For God's sake, do not have another Ireland in India (Applause and hisses.) The people in the French settlements in India had far more rights conferred on them than were given to his countrymen by Britain, for they had the right not only of sending representatives—duly elected representatives—to the Council that met at Pondicherry for the transaction of affairs, but they sent deputies to the National Assembly in Paris. The position his countrymen took up was this. The people of this country had given them education. They had given

them a free press. They had given them local self-government based upon a representative model. For 50 years they had enjoyed those privileges and those rights, and they now asked the people of this country to gratify those ambitions and aspirations which they had awakened in their breasts. They gave them the knowledge, and they must be prepared to abide by the consequences of it. So far back as 1817, in the very early days of British conquests, the first Hindoo College was established in Bengal for the dissemination of English education, and, as he was addressing a Scotch audience, it gave him genuine satisfaction to be able to say that the first pioneers of English education in India were the Scotch missionaries, specially Alexander Duff (applause) and the name of Alexander Duff was graven deep in the recollections of the people of India (applause), and though centuries might pass away, though changes might take place, that name would be cherished with grateful remembrance by the Hindoos. (Applause). In 1843, Macaulay, from his place in the House of Commons, referring to that great and wise step that had been taken, used language which he desired to place before that audience, because that language had about it the ring of prophetic inspiration. It was language which they ought to ponder over and reflect upon. Macaulay said: "It may be that the public mind of India may so expand under our system as to outgrow that system, that our subjects, having lived under good government, may develop a capacity for better government, and, having been instructed in European learning, they may crave for European institutions. I know not whether such a day will ever come, but if it does come, it will be the proudest day in English history" (Applause). That proud day in English history had now arrived, and he called on Englishmen and Scotchmen to prove themselves worthy of that day (applause). Having referred to the rule of Sir Charles Metcalfe as governor, the speaker said, following upon the track of those great and illustrious rulers came Lord

Ripon—(applause)—a name that would ever live in their grateful recollections, and he conceded to them local self-government (Applause). The result of those concessions had been that a mighty change had taken place in the national mind, a revolution had been effected, a national awakening was to be seen on all sides, and notwithstanding that great change, the Government remained the same absolute and antiquated Government as it was before (Applause). He had nothing to say against bureaucracy or despotism—perhaps it was a useful form of Government in the early stages of civilisation. Mill at any rate held that view, but there came a time when in consequence of the changes, the institutions of a country must also be changed. That time had now arrived in India (Applause). Having alluded to the "degrading, miserable, squalid poverty" of many millions of the people of India, and to the creation of a famine fund, the speaker said that fund was dissipated, wasted, and misappropriated—for these were the proper terms to describe it—for the purpose of erecting a frontier defence to guard our Indian Empire against an imaginary enemy. He asked, if such a state of things had ever taken place in this country, would not the strongest Ministry have been swept away by a violent outburst of popular indignation (Loud applause). But who listened to the voice of Indian public opinion? They cried themselves hoarse, they protested and protested in vain, and therefore it was that they wanted to have a voice in the Government of their country (Applause). One-fourth of the revenue of India was devoted to military expenditure. And what justification was there for it? He had looked long for the Russians, but they had never come, and would not come to the end of the chapter; but if they did come, and if India was prosperous and grateful and contented, he would tell them that behind their fine Indian army the Indian races, united to a man, would be found ready to fight and die for India (Loud applause). They did not want the Russians. They knew what

they had to expect from the Russians—they knew that some of them would be sent to Siberia (Applause). They wanted the people of the United Kingdom to remain; they wanted the connection between India and England to deepen that, God willing, it would become permanent and enduring for ever (Loud applause). The continuance and furtherance of that connection was possible only on one condition. The Government must be liberalised, and must be conducted in accordance with national ideas and national aspirations (Applause). He was not prepared to plead guilty to inferiority in intellectual or moral capacity (Loud applause). They did not want Home Rule or democratic institutions or Parliamentary government—they would come up for that by and by, when the British were prepared for it. At present they would be satisfied with a small modicum of representative institutions that they prayed for—half the members to be elected, and the other half to be nominated. In conclusion, the speaker made a stirring and eloquent appeal for the sympathy and aid of the British people on behalf of his countrymen.

THE MEETING AT GLASGOW.

Under the auspices of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, a public meeting was held on 10th June 1890 in the Trades' Hall, Glasford Street, Glasgow, for the purpose of advocating the claims of the Indians to a share in the government of their country. Mr. Bialie Graham occupied the chair.

Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea said this was not a party question; but it was one of national and imperial justice. They appealed with confidence to those universal instincts of justice graven on the heart of every true-born Briton. The

Government of India was one tempered by good intentions (Laughter). The expression "good intentions" carried him very far; it carried him to a place beyond this world which was said to be paved with good intentions. But he would do the British Indian Government the justice to say it was a despotic form of government tempered by some regard for public opinion. That form of government was suited to stages of civilization of an earlier character. But after a time despotism stagnated, and instead of being a blessing it became a curse. He was afraid that stage had been arrived at, and the people asked Great Britain to assist them in introducing the leaven of representation. They had again and again appealed to the Government of India, and now they appealed to the high court of British public opinion. They appealed to the rising democracy of these Islands—(applause)—in the full confidence that when they had heard the people of India they would do them the justice they claimed, and to which they were entitled. They had given to India a high education, a free press, local self-government based upon the representative model; they had opened up the country, stimulated and ennobled the morals of the people, who now asked to have their ambitions and aspirations gratified (Applause). They had, in fact, given India knowledge, and they must take the consequence (Applause). As to the fears of a Russian invasion, he remarked that in India they had heard of this Russian scare since the last forty years, and the Russians had not come, and God willing, they would never come to the end of the chapter (Hear, hear, and laughter). If they did come, and if India was prosperous and contented and grateful, then he could tell the British people this, that they would find behind their fine and splendid Indian army, the multitudinous races of India united as one man ready to die in defence of the interests of the empire (Loud applause). The Indian people did not want the Russians; the Indian people knew what they had to expect from them (Hear, hear). They knew

that some of them would be sent off to Siberia, amongst them himself—(laughter)—and they knew that some of the most cherished institutions upon which the peace and prosperity of the country rested would be taken from them. A free press would disappear in the twinkling of an eye. The Indian people wanted the British to remain where they were; they wanted the connection between this country and India to grow, to subsist, to deepen, and to endure for ever (Cheers). But that was possible only on one condition, namely, that Britain would change the despotic form of her Government in India, nationalise that Government and make it harmonise with national ideas and wishes (Applause). But as yet they were very far from that. The history of India was one long record of broken pledges, and one of the results of these broken pledges was that the highest offices were the monopoly of the ruling race. There were 900 and odds covenanted civilians, and could it be believed that out of these only a dozen were natives of India, and the rest were all Europeans. He was not prepared to plead guilty to the charge of intellectual inferiority which such a state of things implied (Loud applause). He came from a great and ancient race. The blood of his Aryan sires flowed through his veins. He remembered that in the past nebulous times of civilization they founded dynasties and empires. True they were degraded, they were fallen, but still modern India had produced men of whom any nation and any people would be proud (Loud applause). Well they wanted the present state of things altered. And how? Precisely as it had been in the case of the British, by trust in the people (Applause). Give the people, he said, a voice in the Government of their country, and they would be able to take care of their own interests. They did not want Home Rule; they did not want the democratic institutions; they did not want Parliamentary government—although they did not entirely give up their claim to it when the time came—(laughter and applause)—but for the

present, if the British people gave them what they wanted, then they would do a great deal to conciliate the wishes and earn the gratitude of their Indian fellow subjects (Loud applause).

RECEPTION AT THE HOUSE OF MR. E. C. SCHWANN, M.P.

On Tuesday night (17th June, 1890), at Princes Garden, Mr. E. C. Schwann, M. P., and Mrs. Schwann gave a dinner party to the Congress Delegates and held a reception in their honor. Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea in addressing the assembly spoke as follows :—

Ladies and gentlemen, my first difficulty is that I am on a chair. I am accustomed to stand upon a platform and to move about a little, but here I am "cabined, cribbed, confined" within the limits of a chair. But my first words will be words of acknowledgment for the hospitality of our kind host and hostess, Mr. and Mrs. Schwann, and what is still more, for the opportunity they have afforded us of meeting so many distinguished persons and talking in an informal way on a subject which is so near and dear to us. But the feeling which Mr. and Mrs. Schwann have shown in this matter represents really the universal British feeling on the subject (Hear, hear). We have addressed as many as thirty meetings in different parts of the country, I may say in almost every part of the United Kingdom, and wherever we have been we have been received with open arms and with the utmost cordiality. I take it that this expression of kindliness is the index and guarantee of the sympathy which animates the British public in regard to the legitimate aspirations of the people of India, and the constitutional methods which we follow in giving effect to those aspi-

rations. Ladies and gentlemen, we shall go home—I am going to-morrow—with a message of joy and of hope. We shall tell our countrymen there when we go back, that whatever may be their feeling of dissatisfaction with the Government of the country, the great heart of the English people is sympathetically disposed towards them; that there is abundance of justice and abundance of desire on the part of the English people to give them the justice that they demand and to which they are fairly entitled. We feel that all we have to do is to make a simple statement of our case, to state it fairly and explicitly and "nought extenuate nor aught set down in malice," and then justice will be done to us. What we say is this. The British Government has given us education, it has given us a free press, it has given us local self-government, it has opened up the country, it has stimulated thought, it has ennobled, adorned, and illustrated the native Indian character, and the result is that a visible national awakening has taken place, and we call upon the Government to gratify those aspirations which it has awakened in our breasts. We say "You have given us knowledge, and you must take the consequences of that knowledge, you have followed a policy of beneficence towards the people of India, and lo! and behold the fruits of that beneficence are before your eyes and it is not possible for you now to recoil, or fall back upon a policy of repression or of retrogression." It must be thankfully noted that the English conquerors of India from the first moment of their installation in power did their best to promote the material and moral interests of the people. In the early part of the century in Bengal the first English college was established. Then, in 1835, the liberty of the press was conferred, unasked, unsolicited, the spontaneous act of a beneficent, kindly and Christian Government. Ladies and gentlemen, with your permission I would repeat the words, the memorable and historic words which Sir Charles Metcalfe made use of. A deputation waited upon him in Calcutta, and in reply to that deputation he said,

"It cannot be that we are destined by an Almighty Providence to be here in India for the purpose only of collecting taxes and paying deficits; we are here for a higher and nobler purpose altogether, namely, to pour into the East the knowledge, culture, enlightenment, and civilization of the West." That was said in 1835. Then Lord Ripon, a name that will always remain enshrined in our grateful recollections, crowns this edifice of noble institutions, by giving us the great boon of local self-government. The result is that a change has taken place, a mighty change. A man who was in India thirty years ago, if he were to go back to that country would find its aspect changed to such a degree, that it would be almost impossible for him to believe that the country was the same as that which he visited thirty years ago. We are progressing, thanks to the impetus you have communicated to us, by leaps and bounds. All that we ask is that the Government should accept the situation and prove themselves equal to it. We call upon them to do it as much for their interest as for our interest. A despotic government may be a very good form of government in the early stage of civilization, but it becomes a curse and a crime after a certain stage (hear, hear), and I am afraid that that stage has fairly been reached at the present moment. Ladies and gentlemen, you have no conception of the poverty of the people of India. You read in books of the gorgeous magnificence of the East, but these are words of fable and romance; they have no reality whatsoever; in the lurid light of facts they disappear altogether. The earnings of an Indian peasant amount to three pence a day. I do not think it possible to conceive of a people sunk in more squalid depths of poverty than the people of India. Then we have our famines, and we have a costly civil administration, and a bloated military establishment. Add to that the salt duties that are imposed, and the liquor laws, which, thanks to the exertions of our friend, Mr. Samuel Smith, have partly been removed and rectified. Then there is the police which is a scandal and a dis-

grace to civilization. The Government itself admits it, and it is taking steps towards remedying this state of things, Well, we say that in order to bring about a cure for this state of things, it is necessary that you should re-model and re-constitute the Government upon such a basis, that the people may have some voice in that Government. Therefore, taking our stand upon the grand old English principle that there shall be no taxation without representation, we press for the reform of the Legislative Councils, and we say that they should be reconstituted upon the representative model. Our Councils are absolute shams, unmitigated shams. I use strong language, but I speak very soberly and deliberately and under no excitement whatever. Sometimes men are appointed to these Councils who are ignorant of the English language itself, although the proceedings are carried on in that language. A remarkable case occurred the other day. A gentleman, an uncle of Rajah Rampal Singh, was appointed a member of the Vice-regal Council. He did not know a word of the Queen's English. Rajah Rampal Singh was naturally anxious to know how his uncle got on without any knowledge of the language, and when he returned after the performance of his arduous legislative functions, his nephew asked, "Uncle, how did you manage to get on? You do not know English, and the proceedings were carried on in English." "Oh," he said, "I got on well enough. I had a very simple duty to perform. I owed my seat to the grace and favour of the Viceroy, so I closely watched him and when I found that he held his hands up, I held my hands up, and when I found that he dropped his hands I dropped mine, and he was so pleased with me that when I was coming away he actually shook me by the hand and said:—You have been a most useful member of this council.'" (Much laughter). We are anxious that this race of "useful members" may be improved off the face of creation. We really wish to introduce something of reality into the semblance of a Council. Let there be no misconception. We

do not want in the smallest degree to weaken stability, the permanence or the greatness of the British rule in India. We do not want Home Rule, we do not want Parliamentary Government, we do not want democratic institutions. We shall want them by-and-by when the time comes, but for the present, we shall be satisfied with the small modicum of representative institutions that we pray for. We say that half the members of our Legislative Councils should be elected, and the other half nominated as before. The President would be a member of the Government, and, therefore, the Government will have a majority, and naturally, we are so anxious that nothing should be done to weaken the hands of the Government that we actually propose to reserve to the Executive Government the right of veto, so that the Government may supersede any decision arrived at by the majority of the Council. Practically the Councils will be consultative councils. The difference would be this—it is a crucial point, and it is well that you should understand it—instead of the Government nominating our spokesmen, we shall have the right of electing them for ourselves. Therein lies all the difference between the present system and the system which we pray for. This is not a Party question, and we do not wish it to be treated as such. If it so happens that we find one party more than another showing us favour, and that we are thrown into the arms of one of these parties, the responsibility is not ours. We have tried our best in the Congress to treat the question, as far as practicable, from an impartial point of view, without any reference to Party consideration, and I may say that great names are found on both sides. There are Liberal leaders supporting our claims, and there are Tory leaders supporting our claims. There are such men as Lord Kimberley, Lord Northbrook, Lord Ripon and Lord Dufferin, all recommending the elective system in the constitution of the Councils. Then amongst the Conservatives we have Sir Richard Temple and Sir Richard Garth supporting our claims,

and not only so, but we can appeal to the high authority of Mr. Disraeli, who when he was Leader of the House of Commons in 1858, actually recommended that the highest council in connection with the Government of India should be re-constituted upon an elective basis, half the members being elected and the other half nominated. We want the same principle applied, not to the Indian Council, but to Councils of far less importance and far less magnitude in connection with the government of the Indian Empire. I am certain that all we have to do in connection with this matter is to go on pegging away, appealing again and again to those instincts of justice and liberty which are graven deep in the hearts and affections of the English people. We believe in our cause, we believe that persistency in constitutional agitation will culminate in the triumph of that cause, and above all we believe in the sense of justice and the sense of liberty of the English people. We shall, therefore, continue this agitation, and with your help and under God's providence we are bound to win in the noblest contest that has ever warmed the hearts or inspired the energies of men (Cheers).

THE RECEPTION MEETING AT BOMBAY.

The Framji Cowasji Institute was last evening (6th July 1890) the scene of a most enthusiastic mass meeting. Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, the delegate from Bengal, having arrived by the mail steamer, the Presidency Association took steps to give the public an opportunity of acknowledging the services rendered by him and by his colleagues, in a fitting manner. A public meeting was called for half-past four; but so early as one o'clock batches of people began to file into the room, and in an hour every seat was occupied. Additional chairs were then brought in, and placed wherever space could be found for them. These, too, were pounced upon as soon as they were placed. Still, however, an immense crowd was congregated at all the entrances, and pressed

inch by inch into the overflowing hall. Some relief was given to this seething mass of humanity when the galleries inside the hall were thrown open. A tremendous rush took place, and immediately they were full, four deep. But still more room was wanted. On, on they came, the enthusiastic Congress-wallas and at last the outer galleries that hang right over Dhobi Talao were thrown open. It was dangerous to do so, for they are not particularly strong, and the number of the besieging party was enormous. But that was the only mode of appeasing the crowd. These galleries were soon filled. What were they among so many? And when the entrances were hastily closed through fear that the galleries would give way under a heavier strain, an eager phalanx still clamoured for admission. It attacked the building on all sides, and the big staircase was completely blocked. The more active of the assailants endeavoured to push their way into the hall, and if there had been any outlet at all in that direction, these adventurous persons would doubtless have been successful. Hindu turbans and Parsi hats flew about in all directions. The struggles were frantic, and it is greatly to be feared that many persons who had met to bear witness by their presence that they loved one another—politically—felt for a moment or two, that they hated nobody more than their immediate neighbour. So alarming was the crush, that at length the services of the Police were invited. Several European constables endeavoured to clear the hall of its overflowing occupants. The intending spectators were, however, loth to leave and in making a last rush on the staircase leading to the inner galleries a large portion of the balustrade gave way, bringing down with it a constable, a young Parsi, and two Hindus. The Hindus got off without injury; but the constable was badly cut about the head, and the Parsi boy was too much shaken to take any further interest in the proceedings. After this proof of the danger of over-crowding, the Police cleared the building in a trice, and the outer doors were closed and barred. Apparently not less than eight hundred people were thus shut out; while two thousand found sitting or standing room in the hall. Mr. Pherozeshaw Mehta arrived on the spot a little before half-past four, and was received with loud applause. He told the audience that he had found it very difficult to squeeze himself into the hall, and asked that way should be made for Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea. In response to this remark some one proposed an open-air meeting on the adjoining maidan; but Mr. Mehta urged that there were signs of heavy rain. At last a ringing cheer from the street announced the approach of Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, and when he entered the hall, he was received with thunders

of applause, amidst which cries of "Long live Babu Surendra Nath" and "Congress-ki-joy" were to be distinctly heard. The platform was crowded with members of the Presidency Association and many other leading members of the community were seated in the body of the hall. Hundreds of Parsis were present, and altogether the gathering was representative of all sections of Natives. The proceedings began by Mr. Pherozeshaw Mehta observing that the meeting had been convened by the Bombay Presidency Association for the purpose of according their most hearty welcome to Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, the Congress delegate, who had returned from England that morning. He proposed that the Hon. Mr. Jeverilal Umiashunker Yajnik be requested to take the chair. Mr. A. M. Dharamsi having seconded the proposition, it was carried by acclamation. The Hon'ble Mr. Yajnik then took the chair amid loud cheers, and in a little neat speech introduced Mr. Banerjea. After the conclusion of Mr. Javèrilal's speech, Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea rose to address the meeting. The deafening cheers, however, that rent the air at this time and the waving of hundreds of handkerchiefs prevented his speaking for several minutes. At last silence was restored and Babu Surendra Nath delivered an impassioned and eloquent speech for nearly an hour in his usual clear and sonorous voice.

Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea said he thought he should be something less than human if he did not feel almost overpowered by the splendid reception he had received at their hands. He took it not as a tribute paid to him personally, but to the cause he had the honour to represent (Cheers). God grant that it might prosper and thrive until they had secured for their country the inestimable boon of representative institutions. He thought there was something very appropriate in their having that meeting in Bombay to give him that opportunity of rendering an account of his stewardship in the very city where the high honour of Congress delegate to England had been conferred on him. He was the first of the returning army of delegates, and he stood before them ready to tell them the impressions they had formed with reference to their prospects of success in England. He thought their first duty was to render their acknowledgments to all those English

ladies and gentlemen who attended their meetings in thousands, and lent the movement their weight and support. Their acknowledgments were also due to the provincial press of England, that very important factor in forming and modelling the opinion of the United Kingdom. They enthusiastically took up the Congress programme, and earnestly advocated the claims of the people of India to justice and liberty. Wherever they went they were received with open arms and were welcomed with such cordiality as he took to be an index and a symbol of sympathy on the part of English people with the aspirations of the people of India, and also their approbation of the methods they had adopted to give effect to those aspirations. All that the English people wanted to be convinced of was that they in India were thoroughly loyal to the British Crown (Cheers). He impressed this upon the meeting that if they were loyal—and he hoped and trusted they would be loyal to the end of the chapter—and if they continued that appeal from year to year to the instincts of justice of the English people, then the democracy of the United Kingdom, themselves enfranchised, would pave the way for the enfranchisement of the people of India. It must be obvious that something like a crisis had been reached in the affairs of India, at any rate in regard to the internal administration of that country, and the time had come when a new departure must be taken in regard to the principles and policy that must guide the rulers of that country (India). Everyone of them was called upon to do his duty. England and India alike expected that everyone of them in India would do his duty (Cheers). The standpoint they took was that they should not only look to the interests of the national well-being, but refuse to consider anything consistent with that well-being which was not conducive to the permanence of British rule in India (Cheers). There was no India for the Indians alone but in the interests of civilization and prosperity for England and India alike (Cheers). Such was their view of the situation,

and such was the standpoint taken by the English people to be counted by thousands who attended their meetings, and with one voice adopted their petitions to Parliament. He now wished to ask a simple question : he wished to put this simple issue to them as well as to their opponents. Did it stand to reason that Englishmen—long-headed Englishmen—would countenance proposals or proceedings which would tend to weaken, in the smallest degree, the Government of India, or to imperil the influence of the executive authority of that country? But it might be said that it was the easiest thing in the world to gull the English people especially when statements were put forward by men like himself, speaking a foreign language and attired in a quaint constume. He did not think that a correct representation of facts. The average Englishman was singularly shrewd, he had a natural love of justice, a sympathy with the aspirations for liberty which were the crowning qualifications of the English people. It took a long time to move an Englishman, but when he was once moved, then Heaven defend his political opponents. (Laughter and cheers.) With regard to this agitation they had been carrying on in England—and which he hoped for years and years they would carry on—they were very fortunately situated. They suffered from no prejudice. Their colour which was a disqualification in India was a source of advantage to them in England, as they knew from the black man incident (Hisses). There was another remarkable thing which they must specially keep in mind. They were much better off than the Irish. Less than a hundred years ago, Irishmen were considered as nothing short of demons. (Loud laughter and applause.) And language was used to discredit Irishmen which would be incredible in these days. They would be astounded to hear that such language was used regarding even that great man, that great Irish liberator, Daniel O'Connell, by such a woman as Harriet Martineau. Yet the Irish people had by their persistency overcome all such

prejudices, and they were now on the high road to victory (Loud applause). And if they, the people of India, with such advantages in their favour did not succeed, then they alone and nobody else, would be to blame (Hear, hear and applause). But it was not to be supposed, even for a moment, that their way to success was smooth and pleasant, devoid of all obstacles, free from all misrepresentations and prejudice (Hear, hear). They would have to combat misrepresentations, and misconceptions which were the result of such misrepresentations. Of the several misrepresentations and prejudices that were at work he would mention one. There was a misconception that the Congress had for its aim Home Rule for India (Laughter). A retired Anglo-Indian Judge, Mr. Keene, had written an article for the *National Review,* in which he had the audacity to write that Home Rule for India was the goal which the Congressmen wanted to reach. (Shame!) It was, indeed, shameful (Laughter). Mr. Keene ought to have known better. They wanted no Home Rule for India, no Parliamentary Government, no democratic institutions. This had been said from a hundred platforms, on a hundred different occasions and on the responsibility of a hundred different persons. He might also refer to the performances of the Calcutta Correspondents of two of the foremost of English newspapers—the *Daily News* and the *Times* (Continued hisses). They might congratulate themselves that the correspondents of these two influential papers had not fixed their head-quarters at Bombay. (Laughter and cheers.) But it must not for a moment be supposed that they escaped the kind attentions of these writers. He had an opportunity of observing their operations. There was a sort of unholy rivalry between them as to who should be the first to flash across to England such information as would be most injurious to Indian interests. And what were the things that used to be telegraphed for the edification and instruction of the British public? Not any information that was calculated to benefit the people or to cure the defects of the administra-

tion. Not a word was said about the sufferings to which the people in the Sub-Divisions of Jessore were subjected through the pranks of a European Sub-Divisional Officer; not one word in condemnation of those extraordinary proceedings on the part of a Punjab Police Officer which have filled the country with surprise and astonishment. These were forsooth things too paltry to be telegraphed by righteous correspondents interested in the honour and good name of the British Government! But what was the nature of the messages that were duly laid before the British public? The British public were told that forty municipalities in Bombay had been suppressed; that the Jury system had been pronounced by competent critics to be a failure: and that numerous petitions had been sent from different parts of the country protesting against the recognition of the elective element in the constitution of the Legislative Councils. Everything that could tell against the Congress was diligently reported; everything that could tell in its favour was diligently suppressed. The telegrams that appeared in the *Daily News* created painful surprise; for the paper was the great organ of the most advanced form of Liberal opinion and was an avowed friend of the Congress movement. As for the *Times* Correspondent, the less said the better. Richard Cobden used to say that there were three things needed to ensure the success of any movement—a noble cause, steady and devoted advocates, and last but not least, the opposition of the *Times* newspaper. The speaker observed that they had all these three elements of success. Their cause was the noblest which could fill their imagination or stir their hearts; it was supported by men who had already given ample proofs of their undying devotion; and fortunately or unfortunately, if it did not elicit the opposition of the *Times*, they had what was next best to it, the opposition of the Calcutta Correspondent of the *Times!* But these were not the only difficulties they had to overcome. The apathy of the British public was profound. They were far too absorbed in

matters nearer home to be in a position to pay sufficient attention to the difficult questions of Indian administration. English interest had to be awakened, and the English mind had to be educated with reference to Indian matters. Their work in England had but just begun; it would have to be continued, if they meant to triumph in the cause which they had taken up. The battles of liberty are not won in a day. Long and arduous had been the struggles of freedom even in England, her own chosen and consecrated home. There was no question in which the English people were more deeply interested than the repeal of the Corn Laws, and yet it was not until after twelve years of persistent agitation under the inspiration of the greatest orators of the day, that the Corn Laws were repealed and the principles of Free Trade established. One of the noblest measures of the century was undoubtedly the Catholic Emancipation Act. It was after the most earnest efforts extending over nearly the life-time of a generation that Daniel O'Connell succeeded in removing the disability from which Roman Catholics suffered. It was after the labours of a life-time that Wilberforce had the satisfaction of witnessing the triumph of the cause to which he had devoted himself—the emancipation of the Negro slaves throughout the British Empire. The people of India might be more fortunately situated, but they would be under a very grave delusion, were they to suppose that in their case there was a royal road to the attainment of political liberty.

[The speaker gave a short account of the various meetings held in different parts of the United Kingdom, in the course of which he highly eulogized the work done by the British Committee and the earnestness and devotion of Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Caine, Mr. Yule, Mr. Digby and others, and concluded with the following appeal:—]

He was sure that the educated community of India who were the founders of the Congress, who had watched it from

its cradle and had fostered it till it had become a great power in the land would redouble their efforts in its aid, now that the hour of victory was fast approaching. But there were very special reasons why he should make an earnest appeal to the inhabitants of Bombay. Bombay was dedicated to the genius philanthropy. It was strewn broad-cast with the temples of charity—the monuments of the public spirit of their illustrious citizens. Above all, it was the birth-place of the Congress. The words of Mr. Bradlaugh when he last heard him speak at Northampton were still ringing in his ears. Turning to him (Mr. Banerjea), with a look of energy he would never forget, he said, "You, natives of India, must learn to help yourselves, you must expect little or nothing here." They must learn to help themselves; and God, the Father of the Universe, would help those who helped themselves (Loud applause).

THE RECEPTION MEETING AT THE CALCUTTA TOWN HALL.

Pursuant to a notice, a public meeting of the inhabitants of Calcutta and its Suburbs was held on Monday, the 21st July 1890, at the Town Hall, to accord a hearty welcome to Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea. The hall was crowded to suffocation and no less than 3000 persons were present. Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Barrister-at-Law, was unanimously voted to the chair.

Rajah Rajendra Narain Deb moved the first Resolution, which was as follows:—" That this meeting beg to accord to Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea a most hearty and cordial welcome on his return from England as a delegate from the 5th Indian National Congress, and to assure him of the high appreciation of their gratitude for the

signal services which he rendered to our common country while there."

Babu Kali Churn Banerjee seconded the Resolution.

Munshi Hadait Bux supported the Resolution in a speech in Urdu, which was loudly cheered.

The Resolution was then put to the meeting and carried with applause.

Babu Kali Nath Mitter in a short speech moved the next Resolution, which ran as follows:—"That this meeting request the Chairman to sign and present on their behalf the following address to Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea."

The Chairman stood up, and in the name of the meeting, read the following address:—

To—Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, Delegate to England, from the Fifth Indian National Congress.

Sir,—It affords us very great pleasure to accord you a most cordial public welcome on your return from England after a memorable period of arduous and successful labour in your country's cause.

Your mission, as a delegate from the National Congress, was as important as it was difficult. You had to enlighten the British people about the state of affairs in our country. You had to awaken their sympathy with us in our sense of that state. You had to convince them that the remedy we proposed for it, even a partial representation, on an elective basis, in the administration of the country, was both appropriate and feasible.

We congratulate you on your signal success in the discharge of your mission. The impression you produced, and the co-operation you evoked, are full of promise to our hopes and aspirations. We could not have had a surer guarantee for their fulfilment than the active sympathies of powerful constituencies and influential leaders of political thought.

We owe this success to the self-sacrificing zeal, the deep earnestness, the untiring devotion, the judicious tact, and the inspiring eloquence, which you, in common with your fellow delegates, brought to bear upon a just cause. We owe it no less to the genius of the British people ever ready to take up and push forward whatever makes for justice and righteousness.

We feel assured that your labours will bear fruit, even a hundred-fold, in the direction of our cherished aims. May God spare you long to us

in health and happiness, and sustain and prosper you in that noble patriotic career, which has already won you the lasting esteem, admiration and gratitude of the whole country.

Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea then rose and spoke as follows:—

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN,

I do not use the language of convention or of exaggeration when I say that it is impossible for me to find words to give expression to the emotions which at this moment are surging through my heart. There are moments in the life-time of a man when he may truly call himself happy. One of those moments has now arrived for me, when having borne my share, nothing more than my legitimate share, in a great national duty, I find myself, on my return home, the fortunate recipient of your approbation and your esteem. From the moment I landed in Bombay, I found myself overwhelmed by acts of kindness on the part of my countrymen. On my way home from Bombay to Calcutta, there was not a town of any importance which did not accord me a greeting, such, as I am sure, I did not deserve, and which, I took it, was a compliment, not paid to to me personally, but to the cause which I had the honour to represent in England. There are those who tell us that we are a microscopic minority. Well, I will venture to say this— that the microscopic minority is rapidly converted into an overwhelming majority. I would remind those who hold language such as this, of a great saying and of a great truth which they will find in one of the noblest books that adorn the literature of mankind. I would remind them of the truth that a little leaven leaveneth the mass, that the history of reform movements, if it teaches anything, teaches this that a minority— it may be a persecuted, a despised, an opposed minority—if they have truth and justice and liberty on their side are bound to become a victorious, a triumphant, a conquering majority. But I will not indulge in these reflections. They are not,

perhaps, pertinent to the occasion. I will not introduce the bitter notes of strife and controversy to mar the harmony of our proceedings of to-day. I welcome—gratefully welcome—your kind reception, both on personal as well as on public gounds. Calcutta is the city of my birth and of my earliest associations; it is the city of my sires, the city of my public labours, and this vote of to-day is what I shall never forget, and shall always gratefully cherish. The address which you have been good enough to present, is to me a document of great value. I regard it as the charter of your confidence, the covenant of the high commission which you had entrusted me with, and which you hereby renew—it is a command from this great meeting and from my countrymen—it is the voice of the people of these provinces, telling me that as I had shown something of fidelity in their service, I should continue in that service. I bow to the authority of the meeting. I once again accept the trust which you herein renew. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I bring to you a message of sympathy and good-will from the English people. We have every reason to be satisfied with the reception we met with. The British public and the British audiences whom we addressed sympathized with our aspirations; they sympathized with our programme; and they approved of the constitutional methods which we adopted to give effect to that programme. I have always felt the greatest admiration for the English people, and my feeling in this respect has been confirmed and deepened by my experiences of the past few months. A greater, a more sympathetic, or a more tolerant people do not exist on the surface of the globe. You have no conception of the tolerance of a British audience. They will listen—and listen with interest and attention—to things exceedingly disagreeable and unpleasant, provided they are persuaded that you are in earnest, and that you are speaking what you believe to be the truth. It must not be supposed, however, that we met with no opposition, no difficulties. As our distinguished Chairman has

observed, we met with positive opposition at times and we were often subjected to a good deal of heckling and cross-examination on the various points, raised in our speeches. One or two instances will perhaps explain what I mean. At the meeting which was held at Edinburgh after we had spoken, a gallant Major of the Guards, I believe, rose up from one end of the hall and referring to our statements about Indian poverty was pleased to observe that he had been 25 years in India, but had seen no poverty there (he himself was a fat and stout man), and he called in question what we had said in this respect. I rose to reply. I said that I was a native of India, that I had spent the whole of my life-time among my countrymen, and if it was a question of experience my experience was to count for as much at least as his. But this was really not a matter of experience but a question of facts and figures. Mr. Dadabhai Nowroji was one of the soundest of Indian economists and he had after careful calculations, come to the conclusion that the average annual income of a Native of India was only Rs. 20 against £40, which represented the average annual income of an Englishman, £30, which was the average annual income of a Frenchman and £8, which was the average annual income of a Russian. But if the gentleman was unwilling to accept the authority of an Indian economist I would appeal to Sir Evelyn Baring, late Finance Minister to the government of India, who had calculated that Rs. 27, and not Rs. 20, represented the average annual income of a native of India. The gallant major collapsed to the great delight of the meeting, especially of the fairer portion. At the Eleusis Club, I had observed that the Indians were practically excluded from the highest appointments in the Uncovenanted Service. The statement was challenged by a gentleman in the body of the hall who had been out to India. Fortunately for me, the Eleusis Club has a Library attached to it. I had the report of the Allahabad Congress brought out, and read out from a table which, I believe, has been prepared by Mr. Parbutty

Churn Roy, and which Mr. Norton had quoted in the course of his speech. The figures were conclusive on the subject, and my querist sat down to the relief and the delight of the meeting. At Birmingham, Major-General Phelps presided. He is a good and kind-hearted man with genuine sympathy for the people of India. But he began by starting difficulties and objections. Mr. Hume undertook to reply, and did it with such skill and thoroughness as to secure the enthusiastic concurrence of the meeting. Mr. Hume is known to us as a great organizer, but he is also a capital debater and an admirable speaker. General Phelps found fault with the Congress programme, because it did not provide for a second chamber. To this Mr. Hume's reply was, and an effective reply it was—that we did not want even a single chamber, much less a second chamber. General Phelps had referred to the polygamous practices of the Kulin Brahmins of Bengal. Well, I am a Kulin Brahmin and I am not ashamed of it. Mr. Hume pointing to me said: "My friend is a Kulin Brahmin and by the usages of his caste he may, if he likes, marry five hundred wives, but he would as soon think of committing suicide as taking a second wife to himself"—a statement in which I cordially agreed. This was the sort of trial to which we were subjected. But there were difficulties of another character, arising from the apathy and ignorance of the British public, from misconception, the result of misrepresentations, and, lastly, from the peculiarities of party Government. There was no misconception which was more common or more widely prevalent than that we wanted Home Rule for India. We want nothing of the kind. We have said so a hundred times, and from a hundred different platforms. We do not want Home Rule—we do not want to assume sovereign power. We do not wish to supersede the Executive Government, nor even to weaken its hands. On the contrary, it is our belief that if our programme is accepted the Government, instead of being weakened, would be strengthened by enlisting on its behalf the culti-

vated intelligence of the people of India. But the difficulties presented by the necessities of party Government are of a more serious nature, and deserve careful attention. Under the system of party Government, which prevails in England, only one or two questions came to the front at a time. The others are thrown into the shade. Home Rule for Ireland is the all-absorbing topic of the hour. The history of this question teaches us a lesson which we would do well to lay to heart. For ninety years, the Irish people have been pressing for Home Rule, and now they may be said to be within measurable distance of victory. The truth is, the most beneficent measures of this century, which have adorned and illustrated the character of our age, have all been the product of strenuous effort and persistent and devoted toil. There was no measure of law in which the English people were more deeply interested than the repeal of the Corn Laws, and the establishment of the principles of free trade; yet it took twelve years on the part of the anti-Corn Law League, guided by such men as Cobden and Bright to bring about this reform. The triumphs of liberty are not won in a day, and this is a lesson which we would do well to learn.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, notwithstanding the difficulties and the drawbacks in our way, our case was so simple that when we stated it, it went straight home to the hearts and convictions of our audiences. What we said was this. The English people have given us high education; they have given us a free press; they have given us Local Self-Government, based upon the representative model; they have opened up the country; they have stimulated thought and have done much to improve and ennoble the character of the people. Were they now prepared to stifle aspirations which they had awakened? Were they unwilling to abide by the consequences of their own beneficent policy? We received but one answer to an appeal such as this—an answer expressive of the deepest sympathy with our wants and aspirations. We

addressed more than thirty meetings in different parts of the country, mostly in the Provinces. We concentrated our efforts upon the Provinces. Let there be no misconception about the position of London with regard to the rest of the country. London is not to the rest of England, what Paris is to the rest of France. London is the last to take up a cry. The wave of public opinion rolls down from the North. London rides on the crest of the wave. It was in view of this fact, that the organizers of the anti-Corn Law League fixed their head-quarters at Manchester. It was for this reason that we extended our operation chiefly to the Provinces. At all our meetings, petitions to Parliament were adopted in support of the elective element in the constitution of the Councils. It has been said and quite recently by a Bombay Civilian, whose name I forget at the present moment, that we the men of the Congress are bent upon bringing about a state of things, which may eventually lead to the evacuation of the country by our British rulers. Now, is it to be supposed that Englishmen, shrewd, hard-headed Englishmen, would enter into a foul conspiracy with us with a view to the ultimate subversion of their own Government? It might, however, be said that it is the easiest thing in the world to gull an Englishman, especially when the speaker happens to be a voluble Bengali Babu dressed in a quaint dress. There could be no greater misconception than this. The average Englishman is a cold, unimpassioned being whom it takes a long time to move; but when he has once been moved, he may be left to the guidance of his own unerring instincts.

I have already remarked that we held more than thirty meetings. Our first meeting was held at Clerkenwell,—the Division of London which is being contested by our distinguished countryman, Mr. Dababhai Nowroji. Mr. Eve, his rival, has now retired, and we may, with some little confidence, look forward to Mr. Dadabhai's return to Parliament. We really want some Indian Members in Parliament. We

should be in evidence before the House. We should have an Indian party in the House. Our second meeting was held at Northampton, Mr. Bradlaugh's constituency. Mr. Bradlaugh was present, and spoke with his usual energy and eloquence. I received something like a royal ovation, which I accepted in your name and on your behalf, and as your delegate and your agent. Our third meeting was held at Kennington, which was presided over by Mr. Justin McCarthy, a well-known Home Ruler, and a well-known author. We then began the Western compaign. The culminating point was reached at the meeting at Cardiff. A more enthusiastic meeting I have seldom addressed: what they felt was not that we had asked too much but that we had asked too little. "Ask for the full loaf," exclaimed Mr. Johnstone, the Editor of the most influential organ of public opinion in South Wales, "so that you may get half-a-loaf, but do not wait for the crumbs that may fall from the rich man's table." Referring to the attitude of sympathy which Sir Edward Reid the member for Cardiff had shewn in a letter, addressed to the Mayor, Mr. Johnstone said:—"I am very glad, Sir Edward Reid has written the letter that he has written, for if he had written a different letter, it would have been my duty to have told him that he must look out elsewhere for a constituency on the occasion of the next General Election." The success of the meeting at Bristol was due in no small degree to the sympathetic interference of Mr. Justice Norris. Unasked, unsolicited, and prompted by his own sympathies, he sent a telegram to a friend to do all that lay in his power to make the meeting a success. I think I should be only expressing your own feelings in the matter if I say that we are deeply grateful to Mr. Justice Norris for his telegram. The victory at Oxford was due much more to the justice and moderation of your demands than to any power of advocacy which your delegates might have shown on the occasion.

We began our campaign in the North by a garden-party

which was held in the house of Dr. Spence Watson at Gateshead near Newcastle-on-Tyne. Dr. Spence Watson's is an honoured name. He has done great service to India and to humanity. Representatives of all parties were invited to this meeting. The truth is, we organized our meetings on a non-party basis. We bound ourselves to no party, we followed none, but we appealed to those universal instincts of justice, which are graven on the hearts and convictions of the English people, to whatever party they might belong. From Newcastle we proceeded to Scotland, where we held four meetings, the last and the most successful one being held at Glasgow. The success of the Glasgow meeting was greatly due to the influence of Mr. John Tullis, one of the merchant Princes at Glasgow, to whom I had a letter of introduction from my friend, Mr. R. D. Mehta, whom I am glad to see here. From Glasgow, we were summoned by telegram to meet Mr. Gladstone in London. What passed at that interview with Mr. Gladstone is now a matter of history. Mr. Gladstone is a commanding personality in Indian politics; and if we are able to secure his support and sympathies in our case, we may reasonably hope to succeed in that case. The campaign closed with the dinner party in honour of the Indian delegates at the house of Mr. Schwann, the member for the Northern Division of Manchester.

Such has been our work. We may be said to have just begun it. The superstructure will rise upon the foundations which we have laid, wisely or well, it is not for us to say. The work will have to be continued. The deputation must visit England from year's end to year's end. The Political Agency is doing admirable work, but that work has to be added to, enlarged and supplemented. Branch agencies must be formed in different centres, and paid agents must be employed to keep up the interest which the delegates are able to create in any centre. All this means men, and it means money. Those who work and pay are the very salt of the earth. But

those who neither pay nor work how shall I describe them? But I have no fears. If the educated community of India, undaunted by the taunts of their opponents, and unseduced by the smiles of power, continue to tread the even path of duty and to show in the future the earnestness which they have shown in the past, then the agitation which they have set on foot can lead but to one result—the triumphant establishment of representative institutions in this country. But if you grow apathetic over a movement, which you have so far advanced to victory, then you must be prepared to face the consequences of defeat and disaster. The people of Bengal are especially on their trial this year. The next Congress will be held in Calcutta. We are to be the hosts of United India. We are to extend the functions of hospitality to all that is noblest and best in the land. No higher duty, no nobler privilege could rest upon us. We are to repay the debt which we owe to Madras and Bombay and Allahabad. We must maintain unsullied the splendid record of brilliant hospitality which is associated with the Congress movement. You cannot escape from your responsibilities. You have drawn upon yourselves the eyes of your rulers both here and in England. Not by what you say, but what you do, and above all by the spirit of self-sacrifice which you develop will the question be decided whether you are fit for representative institutions or not. It seems to me that in the Councils of Providence, these trials and struggles are vouchsafed to nations, so that they may qualify themselves to enter into the rich possession of that splendid harvest of moral and political greatness, which at all times and in all ages, has been the heritage of emancipated humanity. The Congress movement is, indeed, no mere political movement. Oh no! it is a movement of moral reform of the highest significance. The moral test is the crucial test. When we have proved ourselves worthy of this movement, when we have consecrated it by the spirit of charity and the genius of self-sacrifice, then through the blessing of Divine

Providence who sanctifies every lofty endeavour, through the co-operation of the British public, who sympathize with every just aspiration, through the irresistible march of events which infallibly tend to the good and the true, we may hope to rise to the attainment of those rights and privileges, which, when conferred, would not only be a source of inestimable boon to the people of India, but would cover the English name with honour and credit and imperishable renown. Once again accept my most cordial thanks for the great honour you have done me, and I can only hope and trust that the day may not be distant when it will be our privilege to celebrate in this historical hall, the birth of representative institutions in India.

APPENDIX.

The following letter about the Congress meeting held in Glasgow was received by Mr. R. D. Mehta, the acknowledged leader of the Parsi community of Calcutta, from Messrs. John Tullis and Sons, the merchant Princes of that town :—

DEAR SIR,

Yesterday we had the great pleasure to meet your friend Mr. Banerjea, along with Mr. R. N. Mudholkar from Bombay and to make their personal acquaintance, and we hope now also their life-long friendship. Our Mr. James invited a party of gentlemen to meet them at dinner in the evening prior to the public meeting, which, we have the happiness to know, Mr. Banerjea and his colleagues in the deputation enjoyed very much. The convivial spirit of the Dinner Party was most sustained and animated, and before rising from table Mr. Banerjea in response to his health and best success in the cause he had come to advocate, which Mr. Tullis proposed, made a most eloquent and effective speech. He impressed the gentlemen who met him thus in private most favorably, inspired every one with his own enthusiasm, and evoked a quick and strong sympathy all round. The public meeting was then gone to. The turn out of supporters for the season of the year—this being our holiday and summer season when public meetings are not usually held—was not only good, but admirable. We were delighted to see so many of the citizens there all eager to hear and learn the true facts of things concerning India, and we assure you they were not disappointed. Mr. Mudholkar (after the Chairman) was the first speaker and he stated his case with sobriety, judiciousness and point, and sent his words straight home to the minds and moral convictions of his auditors. Mr. Banerjea followed. His speech was a great success. He struck fire at once. Fact after fact, argument after argument, all bearing directly on the point in discussion succeeded each other, and as each fresh view was presented and led forward to a logical conclusion, the rounds of applause that greeted the speaker was proof that his demonstration had told and was felt by all as legitimate and just. Mr. Banerjea has the gift of eloquent speech. He couches his opinions and proposals always in vigorous and choice phrases, and the charm of what he says has thus an additional power of commanding the acceptance of an educated and cultured audience.

Other speakers followed, and the meeting as a whole was a great success, and we think Mr. Banerjea, when you see him, will express himself as gratified and pleased with it in every way, as we were, exceedingly . . : . We all here including the writer, who had the pleasure of supporting Mr. Banerjea, desired Mr. Banerjea to convey to you on his return home our devoted personal regards which we know he will be sure to do.

It has been a great pleasure to us to accord to Mr. Banerjea and his friends the attention we were able to give, for your sake, and you will do us the kindness to accept them as done in their deepest spirit to your good self. We send you the *Daily Mail* by this post giving a short account of the public meeting, which no doubt will interest you very much. We trust you keep in the enjoyment of the very best of health, full of life and good hope as usual, and sending you our united, most cordial felicitations, and trusting to hear from you soon.

MR. GLADSTONE AND THE CONGRESS DELEGATES.

Extract from the London Letter of the Hindu.

If the telephone had only been so far developed and made available that conversation between England and India were possible, or that what is said in a room in London could be heard in Calcutta, or Madras, or Bombay, it is easy to imagine what a rush there would have been at half-past four yesterday afternoon to the respective instruments in every town in India. The officials at the Central Office would have been worried out of their lives in their endeavour to comply with the request from a hundred inquirers at once: "Connect me with Mr. Gladstone's private room in the House of Commons, behind the Speaker's chair." Not Congress-wallahs only, but even high officials, might have been curious to know what passed in that little room at the time stated. Failing the telephone to which they could themselves resort, your readers must be content with a quill pen, and from my grey goose-quill receive as clear and as coherent a narrative as, consistent with the character of what passed, is possible. In reply to a request made to him a few days ago, Mr. Gladstone expressed his ready willingness to receive the Delegates from the Congress and grant them an interview. His own expression was that he should be 'glad' to see them. He fixed yesterday afternoon as the time, and his private room in the House of Commons as the scene, of the interview. Some of the delegates were, at the time the

engagement was made, still in Scotland, completing their series of meetings and had to be requested by telegraph to expedite their return. They did so, and arrived in London yesterday morning. The delegation to Mr. Gladstone consisted of Mr. Hume, Mr. Banerjea, Mr. Mudholkar and Mr. Digby. Mr. Eardley Norton was to have been present, but he was unable to attend. Punctually at half-past four Mr. Herbert Gladstone, M. P., bright and cheery as is his wont, met the Congress representatives in the Central Lobby, conducted them through the Inner Lobby, along two of the Library Corridors, to Mr. Gladstone's room. Here the deputation found Mr. Gladstone ready to receive them. He advanced nearly to the door to greet his visitors. Mr. Digby introduced the Indian gentlemen first, and, in mentioning Mr. Hume, referred to him as the son of the old Parliamentary economist, Mr. Joseph Hume. Mr. Gladstone greeted Mr. Hume with especial heartiness, twice over saying: "I wish your father were with us now". The illustrious old statesman, who seemed to be in the best of health and spirits, busied himself in placing his visitors in the most convenient manner to himself. He has become slightly hard of hearing, and listens with his hand outspread to his ear. Mr. Hume was courteously bowed to a seat on his right, Mr. Banerjea to one directly in front, Mr. Digby and Mr. Herbert Gladstone sat next, and Mr. Mudholkar was at the Liberal leader's left hand. Mr. Digby having intimated that the delegates wished to pay their respects to Mr. Gladstone personally and to speak with him on the Council's reform proposals now before Parliament, Mr. Gladstone signified his acquiescence, and at once established most friendly relations by saying, "I suppose the two Indian gentlemen speak English?"

"Oh! yes," replied Mr. Hume, "they speak it uncommonly well."

"Ah!" said he, "I have often said nobody speaks such good English and with such admirable intonation as do people from the East Indies."

Mr. Banerjea explained that this was probably due to the thorough manner in which the English, a foreign tongue, was grounded into them while they were young.

Mr. Gladstone, inclining his head as if in agreement, added: "It is singular, how, the farther you go from England the better the English language is spoken. In France, by the French people, it is spoken worst of all. In Germany things are a little better. In Poland there is a great improvement, and also in Russia. But it is only in India and by Indians that it is really well spoken, by those who are not English with intonation and clearness."

After this compliment the conversation turned to politics, and the situation of affairs in India which had brought the delegates to England.

(It must be understood that what follows merely indicates what, without impropriety, may be made public in India.)

Mr. Banerjea spoke of the thirty or more meetings he and others had addressed in various parts of England and Scotland, respecting which Mr. Gladstone asked a number of questions. Before, however, this phase of the movement was discussed fully, Mr. Hume explained to Mr. Gladstone the Congress position and what were its proposals, particularly in regard to the Mahomedan opposition. This latter, indeed, Mr. Gladstone himself brought to the front, characteristically seizing upon the central point of the Reform movement so far as it may affect the proceedings in Parliament. Mr. Hume was able to give Mr. Gladstone most assuring information on this point, while it was pressed upon him that there was no racial difference between the Hindus and the Mahomedans, that there was little likelihood of any serious troubles existing between them. With very slight exception, indeed, the followers of the Prophet, it was stated, were Hindus who had been converted to Moslemism and who, because of their conversion, had not ceased to be Hindus. This point evidently impressed Mr. Gladstone; he signified special interest in it, and recurred to it more than once. Conversation then turned again to the existing situation and the course to be taken.

" I congratulate you, gentlemen," said Mr. Gladstone, "on the interest which is taken in your subject. I do not consider the political tone of the present day is any thing like so good as it was in the past, not so good as it was forty or fifty years ago. But, even then, consider what would have been thought of a proposal to grant, in however mild a degree, representative institutions to India ?" This remark was accompanied by a most expressive gesture indicating the alarm with which the idea would have been received. "From this fact," he continued, "it is easy to see how your question has grown, and how opinion upon it, too, has grown."

Mr. Hume (evidently influenced by his contiguity to Mr. Gladstone, with a gesture of his own, indicative of rising waters) : " Yes the position at which we have arrived is inevitable. It is simply the outcome of the forces we have ourselves called into existence in India."

Mr. Gladstone nodded assent, and, addressing Mr. Banerjea, said : " You have spoken of your meetings, and of the resolutions passed in your favour, how do you stand with regard to the Bill now before the House ? By the way do you both (turning to Mudholkar) stay for the debate ? "

Mr. Banerjea intimated that it would be impossible for him to stop

longer than another week, while Mr. Mudholkar said he thought he should not go away from England for a month.

Mr. Gladstone : "Yes, the debate has been greatly delayed, and we do not know even now when it will come on. Do you expect to get any support from the Conservatives ?"

Mr. Digby explained that he had recently heard, on the authority of an Indian gentleman now in England who was not over-zealous in behalf of the Congress, and to whom Lord Cross had expressed himself, that the Government would not give away. This, too, in spite of so many of the Viceroys of India being in favour of the introduction of the elective principle.

Mr. Hume mentioned the views of Lord Dufferin and Lord Lansdowne, whilst another of the party pointed out that in February last five out of six of the rulers of India were alleged to be in favour of the adoption of the elective principle.

To Mr. Hume's statement, Mr. Gladstone had said, "Yes it is most remarkable that four Viceroys should have expressed themselves in favour of this proposal." (The third and fourth Viceroys alluded to were evidently Lord Northbrook and Lord Ripon.) The further remark rather puzzled him. "Five out of six," he asked, "who are they ?" Upon the names of Lord Lansdowne, Sir Steuart Bayley, Lord Reay, Lord Connemara, and Sir Auckland Colvin being mentioned, he said, "Ah ! you are referring to subordinate Governors too. What I had in mind was Viceroys only. It is very remarkable that there should be such unanimity."

The conversation then swang back to the practical point of Lord Cross's Bill and what is to be done with it.

"Do you expect any Conservatives to vote for the elective principle ?" —Mr. Gladstone enquired.

"No," was the reply. "Or, at least, not more than half-a-dozen. Sir Richard Temple, Sir Albert Rollit, and a few others may vote for Mr. Bradlaugh's amendment. Certainly, not more than ten or a dozen Conservatives at most will support it."

"And the Dissentient Liberals ? How do they stand on this matter ?"

Again the reply was of an unsatisfactory character. It ran somewhat to this effect. Little or no aid could be hoped for from the Dissentients, with the exception of Mr. Caine, who was most heartily with the movement. (Here Mr. Gladstone signified special interest, adding that Mr. Caine occupied an independent position with respect to the party.) As to Mr. Chamberlain, he had made no secret of his intention to do all he could to defeat the projects of the Congress. He had even gone so far

as to say that he might speak against Mr. Bradlaugh's motion, which, by the way, it was remarked, dealt only with the principle of election, leaving details—the how much or how little—to be considered in Committee. No, it was added, there was nothing to be hoped for from the Dissentient Liberals. Mr. Goschen's statements exactly three weeks ago at Northampton, afforded another example of the tendency of Dissentient opinion. Mr. Digby then described in brief terms, Mr. Goschen's attempt to associate agitators for Indian reform with Irish American Leagues. Mr. Gladstone relished the discomfiture which awaited Mr. Goschen in the Calcutta correspondence of the *Times*, where the only Indian friend of the Fenians was found, and he turned out to be not a Congress supporter, but an opponent of the Congress.

Mr. Gladstone's comment on this review of the situation was as follows : "Well, it seems you must be prepared to wait a little longer for the realization of your hopes. You will have to wait a while."

Agreement with this was expressed and it was remarked that postponement was the only thing feared ; the cause was a winning one, and must certainly succeed.

At this juncture (questions in the House being over, and Mr. Smith about to state the views of the Government as regards the work of the Session, an incident which imperatively required the presence of the Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Gladstone rose, expressed the pleasure the interview had given him, and said he must now go into the House. As he was shaking hands with his visitors, the question was asked :

"Will you speak in favour of the adoption of the elective principle when the Bill is proposed for second reading ?"

"What," Mr. Gladstone asked with an animated gesture, "would be the use of my doing so? My appeals count for nothing with such a majority as there now is in the House."

"That may be," was the response ; "but consider what satisfaction a speech, however short, from you, in support of Mr. Bradlaugh's amendment, would give in India. The people there are trusting you, would be much indebted to you if you could speak during the second reading debate."

This way of putting the matter evidently appealed to Mr. Gladstone's best feelings ; he was clearly shaken in his opinion. "Yes, in India," he twice repeated, and, without definitely saying whether he would or would not speak, certainly left the impression that he would do so.

With mutual expressions of friendly regard the great statesman and his much gratified visitors parted, Mr. Gladstone hastening into the House from behind the Speaker's chair.

Afterwards, in the Lobby, Mr. Herbert Gladstone expressed the opi-

nion that his father would speak on the second reading of the Government Bill. He has, said the member for Leeds, taken a good deal of interest in the question, and had seen Mr. Bradlaugh once or twice upon it.

Thus ended an interview, the main points of which only have been given above. Some of Mr. Gladstone's remarks are quoted, and an endeavour has been made to render the incident "actual" to Indian readers. Only those, however, who were present can fully realise the bright alertness, the abounding courtesy, the broad knowledge, the kindly manner, and the general sense of greatness evidenced in a dozen ways, which marked Mr. Gladstone's part in the interview. The late Mr. John Bright once said to the present writer: "What you have wanted in India for a long time was such a man as Mr. Gladstone, or, rather, Mr. Gladstone himself. Not only for the sake of your finances generally, but in regard to the whole range of your administration, you have needed Mr. Gladstone. But we cannot spare him. He is too valuable at the centre. He cannot be parted with for a portion of the Empire only." It is certainly the feeling of all who were privileged to be in Mr. Gladstone's room in the House of Commons yesterday afternoon that Mr. Bright was perfectly right in the opinion he expressed, and that it is India's misfortune that England has never been able to spare Mr. Gladstone for service in her great Indian Empire. Half-a-dozen years of Mr. Gladstone in his prime would have made of India a more prosperous, a more contented and a more trustworthy element in the British Dominions than it is at this moment, or than it can ever be while the present despotic and unsympathetic mode of rule continues.

BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

Extract from Minutes of a Meeting of the British Committee of the Congress, held on June 24, 1890.

The meetings of the summer Campaign held in various parts of the United Kingdom having come to an end, the Committee wishes to place on record its sense of their great value in bringing the question of Indian Reform before the British public. On the whole, the meetings have been

well attended, and in every case the audiences manifested great interest in the reform proposals of the Congress, and were enthusiastic in favour of the resolutions submitted, such resolutions in every instance having been adopted and petitions sent to the House of Commons praying for the acceptance of the Congress scheme of Council reform.

The Committee desires further to express its high appreciation of the services rendered by the gentlemen delegated by the Congress in December last who have visited England, namely :—

Surendra Nath Banerjea,
R. N. Mudholkar,
A. O. Hume, and
Eardley Norton ; and also

to Dadabhai Naoroji and to Syed Ali Iman, resident in England ; all of whom have addressed several meetings ; particularly does it desire to recognise Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea's prolonged and able services ; he attended all the meetings and succeeded, by his powerful oratory, in exciting an unusual degree of interest among his audiences.

Having regard to the number of questions before the British electorate, the Committee feels it must remark that the work of educating public opinion has only been begun, and that prolonged effort will be required to bring the Congress proposals adequately before the constituencies.

Resolved : That a copy of this Minute be forwarded to the Joint-General Secretary of the Congress in India for circulation to the respective Standing Congress Committees, and to each of the gentlemen named therein.

25, Craven Street,
Charing Cross, London.
June 25th, 1890.

BRITISH COMMITTEE
of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

Report of Meetings held in the West of England and South Wales, 1890.

"REFORM FOR INDIA."

In sending you a report of the work achieved in connection with the meetings held in the West of England and South Wales, at which the claims, the people of India are making for partial representation on the

Supreme and Provincial Legislative Councils, were laid before the electors, and which meetings at your request I arranged, organized and attended, I'am pleased to be able to inform you that the work has throughout been attended with marked success.

The meetings were addressed by the delegates from India, Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., and Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, B.A. ; and also Mr. D. Noaroji and Syed Ali Iman and were held in the following places on the dates mentioned :—

Taunton	Monday	April	21st
Plymouth	Tuesday	„	22nd
Truro	Wednesday	„	23rd
Exeter	Thursday	„	24th
Barnstaple	Friday	„	25th
Swansea	Monday	„	28th
Cardiff	Tuesday	„	29th
Bristol	Thursday	May	1st
Bath	Friday	„	2nd

Although the number of those attending the meetings in no instance shewed, by comparing them with the number usually present at Political Meetings, that the question has that attraction for English audiences, which political questions, on matters relating to subjects and to a part of the Empire nearer home have ; yet considering the utter absence of any enthusiasm, the entire want of interest in the question, the most lamentable ignorance on Indian administration and I might add in some cases, ignorance as to where the Indian Empire is geographically, I think your Committee will be glad to learn, that although lacking in numbers, the meetings were in no way devoid of interest and enthusiasm, whilst the subject "Reform for India" was being unfolded before them ; and the strongly expressed request made after each meeting that the delegates should, at some future date, again attend and give addresses on the subject clearly demonstrates the deep impression made on the minds of those present.

Taking into consideration the circumstances I have above mentioned, the short time at our disposal for organizing, the lateness of the season for political gatherings, the uniformly fine weather which, with a single days' exception, we experienced during the Tour, (a fact which in early spring militates most strongly against indoor political gatherings in the West of England) and that this was the first occasion on which the question was placed before English audiences, at least in such a clear, comprehensive and forcible manner, the numbers, which I herewith append as attending

the meetings in the various towns will show that the means taken for organizing and creating interest, and I may fairly say for making meetings, were not without effect.

There were present at :—

Taunton	about	150	persons.
Plymouth	"	1,000	"
Truro	"	150	"
Exeter	"	200	"
Barnstaple	"	150	"
Swansea	"	600	"
Cardiff	"	700	"
Bristol	"	350	"
Bath	"	500	"

The small audience at Bristol is to be accounted for by the Electors there being fully occupied in the impending Bye-election, caused by the death of the late Liberal member, Mr. Handel Cosham, M.P., and also by three other political meetings and one large social-political gathering being held on the same evening. At least one of these was postponed to the night on which we had decided to hold our meeting, before it was known to the local committee who could not then alter existing arrangements.

The means taken to organize the various meetings were by posters, placards, the distribution of hand-bills, advertisements and press notices in local papers, and also by tickets which were freely distributed among Political Associations, Clubs and the inhabitants generally.

According to your request an endeavour was made to make the meetings non-political in their character. Speakers were invited to take part and joint committees of Liberals, Conservatics and Liberal Unionists, were in some instances endeavoured to be formed ; but I regret to say that in every case Liberal Unionists and Conservatives declined to indentify themselves with the movement ; and the meetings were therefore composed almost entirely of members of the Liberal party.

Considering the strong attitude the Congress has taken up with respect to Lord Cross's Bill, one cannot be surprised at their declining to support the movement.

AT TAUNTON the meeting was held in the London Hotel Rooms with Dr. Wetherell a retired Indian resident in the chair. The Rev. Mr. Aveling, M. A., Principal of the Independent College, took part and the audience evinced much enthusiasm and appreciation of the facts adduced by the delegates.

PLYMOUTH meeting was held in the Guildhall, and was by far the largest of the series. The Rev. Professor F. E. Anthony, M. A., President of the Liberal Association took the chair, and Mr. H. Whitfield, Editor of the *Western Daily Mercury* Plymouth, in proposing the first resolution, made a vigorous speech appealing for Justice for India. The enthusiasm was very marked in response to the points put forward by the delegates.

At TRURO the Town Hall was used and Mr. Robert Dobell, Honorary Secretary, Liberal Association, presided. The night was wet and this accounts for the small audience. Cornishmen like to think over political reforms before they get very enthusiastic about them; but the solid impression made on those present by each speaker though not warmly responded to, was clearly visible to and the impression will be felt through West Cornwall.

AT EXETER Sir John B. Phear, a retired Indian judge, presided over the meeting which was held in the Athenœum. The sympathetic response and quickly interjected remarks, coupled with hearty applause, testified to the justice the audience felt India had in her case as laid before them.

AT BARNSTAPLE the president of the Liberal Association, Mr. W. P. Hiern, M. A., J. P. presided. The meeting was held in the Bridge Hall and North Devon electors showed that India will find in that part of Devon warm advocates of her just demands.

AT SWANSEA the Mayor Mr. F. Freeman presided at the Albert Hall meeting and a numerous audience most energetically showed that Wales would not be behindhand in espousing the cause of India so ably put forward.

AT CARDIFF, the Metropolis of South Wales, a remarkably appreciative audience and second in numbers only to Plymouth was presided over by Mr. Moxey, M. P. After Mr. Hume and Mr. Banerjea had delivered addresses, Mr. Sowleg Johnson, Editor of the South Wales *Daily News* made, in proposing the first resolution, a most impressive and important speech in which he said, it would be of little use for any Liberal member or candidate to come to that part of Wales who did not place the claims India was making for reform of her administration well forward in his political programme. The applause of those present strongly expressed their hearty concurrence with this statement. A letter was read from the sitting member Sir Edward Reed, C. B., M. P., which evoked warm approval by his earnest and cordial support of the meeting.

AT BRISTOL a telegram was read from Mr. Justice Norris, of Calcutta, formerly an inhabitant of Bristol who expressed his sympathy with the

movement asked the people of Bristol to give the delegates a hearty reception.

AT BRISTOL Mr. Herbert Thomas J. P. presided and the meeting was held in the Colston Hall. Here also the audience, though not large, showed a thorough appreciation of the Question at issue. Miss Carpenter's connection with Bristol had somewhat educated its inhabitants in the affairs of India.

AT BATH the Guildhall was used for the last meeting of the series, which was of a very satisfactory character. A very representative audience both in point of numbers and appreciation of the subject was presided over by Sir Charles Hobhouse a retired Judge of the High Court of India, who in a long speech ably expressed his support of Reform in Indian administration.

The literature you forwarded was distributed at the meetings.

While closely taking note of the effect these meetings have had on the audiences, one cannot fail to observe the remarkable interest which was taken in the subject immediately the delegates had begun to unfold the first chapters of the story of Indian Administration. Where there was, as I have said, an apathetic indifference to the question, the speakers soon aroused the keenest interest and enthusiasm.

Two causes undoubtedly conduce to this.

First.—The delegates have lived most of their lives in India and have an intimate knowledge of the conditions which necessitate the suggested reforms.

Second.—The able and powerful manner in which the speakers dealt with the subject.

The course of procedure adopted was for Mr. Hume to speak immediately after the Chairman, and then Mr. Banerjea followed: after which the first resolution was moved and seconded by local speakers and supported by Mr. Naoroji. This was done in all cases when Mr. Naoroji was with us, except at Bristol, at which place Mr. Naoroji was the first speaker.

I would, with the utmost deference, suggest that this method be adopted, at all future meetings where practicable; as placing ourself in the position of one of the audience, the clear and forcible manner in which Mr. Hume lays his case—the hard facts of Indian administration, the condition of the people, the modesty of their demands—before his audience, appeals at once to the strong sense of justice in the practical minds of an English assembly.

And although English audiences may be largely swayed by sentiment, they must always have the facts of the case before them, however, unpalatable, to guide them in their judgment and to fix them in their decision; and it is also necessary on account of the entire absence of the rudimentary knowledge of the manner in which governing bodies are formed and the work of the administration is carried on in India. Mr. Hume's statements are of special service in this respect.

I cannot but remark on the great assistance the Indian National Congress movement has already received in this part of the country, from the eloquent orations delivered by Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea. His command of language, range of illustration and powerful appeals riveted the attention of the audiences.

I have rarely seen political audiences raised to a higher pitch of enthusiasm, stirred to a deeper sense of injustice, or at times, utterly electrified by the passionate appeals Mr. Banerjea made for his countrymen to be admitted the right of a voice in the Government of their country.

At all the meetings the demand was that Mr. Banerjea should visit them again; and I would point out to you the great advantage the movement would gain by his presence, as that alone would ensure overflowing audiences in the towns already visited. I would strongly urge the importance of this fact upon your committee as I have already urged it upon Mr. Banerjea himself as well as Mr. Hume, and in confirmation of this I would remind you that immediately after the Cardiff meeting, Mr. R. N. Hall on behalf of the South Wales Liberal Federation, of which he is the Secretary, entreated Mr. Banerjea to revisit Cardiff before leaving for India, to address a meeting of the representatives of the constituencies in South Wales in the largest hall in Cardiff, at which he promised there would be an audience of several thousands of persons to hear the claims of India. I will make a similar promise for Plymouth.

Mr. D. Naoroji did good service by his criticisms of the financial administration of India, its excessive costliness in working &c.; and hope was expressed that he would again find occasion to address similar meetings.

Syed Ali Iman's presence was useful in refuting the accusation that the Mahomedans are not associated with the Reform movement.

The effect of the addresses by the delegates was also shewn in the remarks of the proposers and seconders of the resolutions. I have already mentioned the speeches of Mr. H. Whitfield, Editor, *Western Daily Mercury* and Mr. Sowley Johnson, Editor, *South Wales Daily Press.*

And these are no exception but mark the general expression of feeling *viz* :—"That indifference in Indian affairs is due entirely to want of knowledge of Indian administration and not to want of sympathy with the Indian people."

You will have noted in the daily papers I sent you the full reports which the Local Press have given to the meetings, and in some cases the excellent leading articles which have appeared in the *Western Daily Mercury*, *South Wales Daily News*, *Western Times* (Exeter) and other papers in sympathetic criticism and support of the movement. I would draw your attention to the fact, that where nothing was said in praise of the Congress movement little was said in adverse criticism of it ; and further I submit the importance with which the press view the agitation may be judged by the full reports of the proceedings.

AUGUSTINE HONEY.

The correspondent of the *Weekly Despach*, a Sunday penny paper published in London and which has a very extensive circulation there, gives the following account of an interview which he had with Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, the Bengal Delegate of the Congress :—

Correspondent : You have come as a delegate from the Indian National Congress. May I inquire what is the nature of your mission ?

Mr. Banerjea : The Indian National Congress ever since it held its first meeting at Bombay in 1885, has been pressing for the introduction of the representative element in the constitution of the Indian Government. Nothing has been done in this direction, and it thinks that the time has come when the reform can no longer be postponed with advantage to the country or the Government. Accordingly, at the last session of the Congress, several of us were appointed as delegates to come over to this country to appeal to the English constituencies.

Correspondent : What is the precise nature of the reforms you suggest ? Mr. Banerjea : we have what are called Legislative Councils—bodies which impose the taxes and make the laws. The members are all nominated by the Government, They are sham councils altogether. It would be the same thing as if your Parliament was to consist exclusively of members appointed by Lord Salisbury under the advice of Mr. Balfour. We want to reconstitute these councils upon a partially elective

basis ; but the sovereign power will remain where it is at present vested —viz., in the Executive Government of the country. We say that half the members should be elected, the other half will continue to be nominated as before ; and the president will be either the Viceroy or one of the provincial governors, as the case may be ; and further, the Executive Government will have reserved to it the right of vetoing any decision of the council if such a step should be considered necessary in the public interest, recording, of course, the reasons for such a step. The councils will thus be purely consultative in their character, with this departure from the present system that the people will have the right of electing their own representatives instead of the Government doing it for them.

Correspondent : How many meetings have you held since you have been in this country ?

Mr. Banerjea : I have been here now for a little more than six weeks, and I have addressed twenty meetings in different parts of the country. We have had a very successful campaign in the West of England, including Wales ; and everywhere we have been received with the utmost cordiality. The Provincial Press has been especially sympathetic in its attitude.

Correspondent : Do you appeal to any particular party with a view to get what you want ?

Mr. Banerjea : No. We bind ourselves to no parties, but appeal to the sense of fairness and justice of all parties. Our meetings have hitherto been organised upon a non-party basis ; but I am bound to say the sympathy we have received has chiefly come from the Liberal party as a party, though no doubt many Conservatives are with us in this movement.

Correspondent : I suppose you are aware that there is a Bill at the present moment (the Indian Councils Bill) before the House of Commons. What is your view and that of your countrymen with regard to that measure ?

Mr. Banerjea : Lord Cross's Bill has given rise to very serious disappointment at home, and large meetings have been held in the great towns of India protesting against the Bill, as it does not provide for the elective element in the constitution of the Councils. The agitation, I am afraid, is likely to continue.

Correspondent : What is to be your programme in the future, and what do you purpose doing if the Government does not concede to you what you want in the shape of a partial extension of representative institutions ?

Mr. Banerjea : Early in June we go on a campaign in Scotland, holding meetings and explaining our views, and we mean to repeat this deputation to England from year to year until we get what we want. The Government has no conception of the earnestness and intensity of feeling which lie behind the movement we represent. India is quite a changed country. We have received English education, and we are anxious to have English institutions in our midst, so far as the circumstances of India will permit.

Correspondent : What is the strength of your deputation, and how many of these gentlemen are now in this country !

Mr. Banerjea : Ten gentlemen were appointed delegates to England by the Congress, consisting of nearly 2,000 representatives from all parts of India. Six of these gentlemen are now in England.

The *People's Friend* thus notices Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee's speech at the Congress-Meeting at Finsbury :—

His speech on the occasion was magnificent and electrified his learned hearers by its close reasoning, by the appropriate language in which he clothed his ideas, and by the spirit which breathed in his utterances. Experienced speakers in and out of Parliament found in the Babu a deal which recalled the sonorous thunders of a William Pitt, the dialectical skill of a Fox, the rich freshness of illustration of a Burke, and the keen wit of a Sheridan. The Babu is an effective speaker and understands the art of striking while the iron is hot. After having kept his audience in enthusiasm with his pictorial description of India's progress under the British Government, after having recited the various details of that astounding progress and pressing upon his hearers the gratitude and loyalty of the people, he asks his audience—if it is wrong to petition for more privileges, which, granted, will not alienate but more closely bind the peoples of the two countries together. He does not demand the privileges sought, but shows the advantages both to England and India, if the concession is granted. The Congress movement was not a party movement, but one which aimed at the general good, politically, socially, and in other ways. The speaker was constantly applauded and his peroration was admired. He pointed to himself and his co-adjuters as the results of British administration. He referred to the Universities which were turning out annually thousands of graduates and undergraduates, "men steeped in the literature of the West, steeped in your political philosophy and your political principles ;" and again, he adroitly says "having become instructed in

European knowledge, they are craving for European institutions; and having lived for so long under these influences, not only has a great change taken place in the outward and in the material circumstances of the country, but a visible national awakening is to be seen on all sides." The brief extract points to acuteness of the orator; and he has just followed in the wake of the greatest orators of the world—of Cicero of Rome, of Pitt of England and of Mirabeau of France. Throughout this powerful speech, he entirely drops himself and makes the Indian Natives' cause his own.

The *Western Times* thus speaks of the Congress demand for a recognition of the representative principle in the Government of this country:—

Mr. Banerjea, the Indian gentleman, who visited Exeter last week, came here to enlighten us not only as to the needs of India but in his person to show what manner of men our fellow subjects are. After listening to his address, there was little room for hesitancy in acknowledging that a race of whom that gentleman was a specimen were justly entitled to press for some share in their self-government. All Indians, however, are not of the order of highly trained intellects which Mr. Banerjea has attained, and there are many considerations why it may be inexpedient to think of establishing a representative system from Himalaya to Comorin having any resemblance to that which centuries of struggle have confered on the robust race of these Islands. But this is not asked for, nor indeed contemplated in any measurable future. The plea of the Hindoos is for a much more primitive form of representation—one that will enable them to elect a few representatives on the Supreme Council which has the power to make laws for India. This is no extravagant claim. It is one which is backed up by millions of natives, whose persistent pressure is bound to prevail. Under any circumstances the composition of the Council of the Governor-General would secure that preponderance of power on the side of the supreme authority which from the nature of the connection between Great Britain and her Eastern Dependency, must continue to exist as long as the connection lasts. On the other hand, the rights and dignity of the people of the country demand respect; their thought, interests, and industry claim and ought to have, adequate representation in the Councils of the State. Nor can it be doubted that the recognition of this right, would, in judicious hands, lead to the closer union of the two countries, whose material interests are now linked by the ties of exchange in respect to a commerce that represent over half the total trade of India.

The *South Wales Daily News* makes the following complimentary remarks on Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea's speech at the Congress meeting in Cardiff :—

It may surely be now admitted that India has at last found a voice in Cardiff. Had the inhabitants of the town had the slightest conception of the powerful and magnificent eloquence of Surendra Nath Banerjea, the learned Principal of the Ripon College, at Calcutta, no hall would have been capacious enough to contain the crowd that would have struggled to get within the sound of his voice. His speech, if fully reported, could not fail to charm, to enlighten, and even to convince but the impassioned delivery, revealing at one and the same time the accomplished orator and the true patriot, combined with the grace of language to carry every word to every heart. We can hardly imagine those who heard it ever forgetting it, and yet those who were present had to bear in mind while the speaker passed from period to period that he was a native of a country which the Queen is proud to own as a portion of her dominions, which all our countrymen mention with mingled pride and boastfulness, and which, nevertheless, is not allowed to have any voice whatever in the control or management of its own affairs. That this is synonymous with misrule, we need hardly add, for it is well-known throughout the British Empire as one of the results of centuries of bitter experience, that those who have no vote are shown precious little consideration by those who make and administer the laws.

The *Evening Empress*, a Tory paper, has the following complimentary paragraph on Babu Surendra Nath's speech at the Colonial Hall :—

Last night's meeting at the Colonial Hall to hear addresses on Indian reform proved that these Indian gentlemen can be as polished and eloquent and reasonable as our English orators and that there is still a lamentable lack of information on Indian matters among a large class of Englishmen. Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea charmed all by the real eloquence of his speech, and his peroration was exceedingly fine. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji—Lord Salisbury's black man—is not such a good speaker though he speaks smoothly and roundly enough.

Among its "Echoes of the tone," the *Somerset Express* has the following, with reference to Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea's speech at Taunton :—

When I heard Mr. Banerjea speak I was surprised, startled, electrified. The English was pure, the pronunciation perfect, the rhetoric a pattern of style and ability, and the address as a whole one that well deserved the applause with which it was greeted. We are accustomed to good speaking in Taunton—I do not refer to Mr. Allsopp's poetical effusions, or Mr. Elton's conversational drip—but we have seldom had the privilege of listening to a grander oration more ably delivered than that with which our friend from the far East favoured us on Monday evening. The only thing like it that Taunton has recently enjoyed was that speech by Mr. W. Redmond, M. P., in the autumn of last year. That too was a plea for justice, and it produced a marked effect upon the Taunton people. By giving full play to the sentiments which the two speeches evoked we might kill two birds with one stone—satisfy the healthy requirements of Ireland and India—and so do our duty—in other words vote for and return Liberal members for Taunton and Somerset. The rest would follow as a necessary sequence.

The *Royal Cornwall Gazette* writes about the present Congress agitation as follows:—

Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, a learned Indian gentleman, is doing good service by going on tour to awaken some interest in his country among us Britishers. The fact that each vote in this country has some measure of responsibility for the well-being and happiness of nearly three hundred millions of our fellow creatures in the far East is hardly sufficiently realized by many of us. Everybody agrees that an effort should be made to awaken the people of this country to a sense of their responsibility to India and of their duty to govern it, according to Lord Northbrook's maxim, for the benefit of the people of India. And now the appeal comes to us in the form of a request, which was urged at the Truro Town Hall last evening, to extend some sort of Home Rule to India. There are two different ways in which we may view India and the other great dependencies of the British Empire. We may look upon them merely as the cause of our national aggrandisement and prosperity, or we may look upon them as put into our charge by the Providence of God in order that we may promote their happiness and welfare. Of course the latter is the more creditable as well as the higher way of regarding our great empire.

The Newcastle *Daily Leader* thus speaks of the Congress Meeting held in Newcastle:—

It is perfectly certain that no Englishmen have ever at any time put forward a plea for political justice with so little exaggeration and with such excellent good sense as characterised the two Indians yesterday.

They were asking for the smallest possible instalment of a great reform. They were contending for the dignity of their country, for elementary rights of citizenship, and for an amount of political liberty so small that the meanest of Englishmen would reject it with derision. In making these demands, nevertheless, they displayed a patience and moderation of temper which might almost be called excessive, and Mr. Banerjea's arguments were as remarkable for the statesmanlike breadth with which he did justice to the exigencies of our imperial position as for the eloquence and force with which he pointed to the wrongs of his countrymen.

* * * * * * * * *

The Indian delegates do well to place their case before the English public, but they must not forget their public at home. English Governments, as all our own experience has proved, help those who help themselves. Not a single victory of our domestic progress has been won until resistance was no longer possible. Mr. Banerjea wisely said yesterday that we do not want another Ireland to India. We do not want it, but, when eighty-five Irish members of Parliament are asking for self-government and are asking for it in vain, the lesson is too plain to be misunderstood. India must show itself in earnest, and when it has spoken with an emphasis and unanimity not to be mistaken the English people will be in earnest also.

Talking of the possible outcome of the proceedings of the Congress Deputation, the *Morning Post* says :—

Let us imagine Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea addressing an English audience and telling them that he was a sample of what British rule had produced among the higher classes of natives—yet he was declared to be unfit to exercise the franchise and elect a representative to a council which even under the scheme of the Congress, would still be completely controlled by the official element. Such a man, speaking with the wonderful force and effect with which he is endowed, would, and will readily persuade his hearers that to refuse to grant a modicum of self-government to his brethren is absurd and unreasonable, and they will quickly accept the explanation that the officials of the Indian Government fear the exercise of the right of enquiry and interpellation if possessed by popularly elected critics. . . .

The *West Middlesex Advertiser* thus writes about the Congress Meeting held at the Eleusis Club, Chelsea.

The hall was very crowded, and many well-known local politicians were present. At the conclusion of the lecture Mr. Banerjea was subjected to a great deal of friendly speaking which he stood remarkably well

answering all the questions with a tact and smartness which put the large audience in great humour. Mr. Cotton characterised Mr. Banerjea's lecture as "very able and lucid," and Mr. Smith, "as a splendid evidence of the capacity of the Indian mind."

A correspondent writes to *India* on the same subject as follows:—

How wonderfully happy in their selection has been the National Congress in such an able advocate as Mr. Banerjea. I am sure, sir, there were members present deeply impressed by his eloquence and the lucidity of his explanation and answers to the many questions submitted to him. And all must have felt his vast superiority over ourselves from an intellectual point of view, and that it is a gross injustice that such vast numbers of our Indian brethren are outside the pale and with no voice in the constitution or government of their country. Such earnestness, eloquence and clearness displayed by Mr. Banerjea in his appeal for simple justice for his countrymen will, I feel sure, soon be crowned with glorious success.

Mr. F. Sonley Jonstone says:—

Before resuming his seat he said that he could not sit down without espressing his admiration of the magnificent speech they had had that night from Principal Banerjea. Its felicitous language, its eloquence, its earnest enthusiasm, and its dignified and stately delivery compelled him to say that he had rarely, if ever, heard it surpassed at any of their meetings.

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT INDIA.

As a sequel to the meetings held in Newcastle, the following correspondence, taken from the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, will be of interest:—

SIR,—I notice in the interesting article entitled "Representative Government in India," which appeared in your issue of yesterday some misconceptions which, with your accustomed love of accuracy, you will, I am sure, be glad to have removed.

Your remark that Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea met on the 20th March some 70 of his friends at a dinner party in Calcutta, who made speeches and wished him hearty success on his present mission, and you very rightly remark that a convivial gathering like this does not entitle Mr. Banerjea to plead on behalf of the people of India. You were not aware, I presume, that Messrs. Banerjea and Mudholkar's claim to speak for and on behalf of the people of India is based on the fact that they were unanimously appointed to perform this task by the 1,900 delegates in public session assembled at Christmas last at Bombay, and that these

1,900 delegates had been elected by over five millions of voters in every province, in every ditsrict, nay in every at all considerable town in British India (Burma excluded), and lastly that these five millions of voters, directly as heads of households and village notables, represented nearly, if not quite, one hundred millions of the population, and, indirectly, the general sense of the people as a whole.

You are under the impression that it is absurd to speak of an Indian nation because India is nearly as big as Europe and includes numerous provinces whose people were at one time almost as distinct as those of France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. But if all the countries of Europe had been for one hundred years under a common Government, and had for 50 years been educated in a common language, and nurtured as it were on the same literature—if they were all under precisely the same codes of law, civil and criminal, all paid precisely the same taxes, all served in the same army, all had exactly the same secular interests; in such a case—and this is precisely India's case—there would be, I submit, no absurdity in speaking of the European nation. As a matter of fact all the several peoples inhabiting British India are far more nationalised as one than are the people who inhabit the Austrian Empire for instance, and yet no one thus far has denounced it as absurd to speak of the Austrian nation.

Then referring to Mr. Mudholkar's remark that, as regards the Congress movement, there was unanimity amongst the people of India "from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin" (which is the simple truth) you remark "in truth, however, there is no such unanimity, on the contrary there is desperate native hostility to the movement." In this matter, believe me, you have been quite misinformed. There is practically no native hostility to the Congress movement. Out of the 210 millions of Indians under our direct rule there are not even a quarter of a million opposed to either the Congress or its programme. There are a few Mohamedans, men who have been, and are, seeking favours at the hands of the officials, who have, to please the bureaucrats they toady, raised a factitious opposition, but they have been emphatically denounced by the great bulk of their co-religionists. There are also two or three Hindus of some little (but not great) reputation who, in a mild, half-hearted way, have found fault with particular items in the Congress programme; but, setting these inappreciable factions aside, the whole of the people of India are thoroughly unanimous in supporting the Congress.

As for the Rajah of Bhinga, if you had any conception of who and what this miserable person is you would have been the last man to speak of him as bearing the most influential name in Oudh. He is a new Gov-

ernment Rajah, absolutely devoid of the smallest influence and only half-educated, and the letters that appeared in his name, and which he is unable to understand much less to write, were written as Sir C. Dilke truly says in his recent work, by a prominent English official. The Rajputs to a man, specially and prominently, are with the Congress, as are the Mahrattas and Panjabis.

Lastly, when you speak of the ascendancy of the Bengalis you are clearly not aware that at the last Congress out of 1,900 delegates not above 150 were Bengalis, and, even if we include the Beharis, a stalwart, Hindustani-speaking people, though under the Bengal Government, and also all the stray Bengalis who were elected in other provinces, they were less than 200 in number.—Yours obediently,

ALLAN O. HUME,

General Secretary of the Indian National Congress.

NEWCASTLE, *June 4th, 1890.*

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN INDIA.

We gladly give publicity to the letter from Mr. A. O. Hume, General Secretary of the Indian National Congress, animadverting on the article in our Tuesday's issue under the heading, "Representative Government in India." We are indebted to the writer for the statement of his views on the subject, being satisfied notwithstanding the differences made to appear between us, we are equally desirous of getting at the simple truth of the matter, and equally anxious for the welfare of the populations of India. But while ready to accept the correction of our correspondent, it is surely not unreasonable of us, in the first place, to require from him evidence that there is room for correction—proof, in short, that we are in error. He begins by finding fault with us for having called in question the allegation that Messrs. Mudholkar and Banerjea are the representatives of 250,000,000, people. Now we hold that anybody in any country of Europe is entitled, on the face of it, to call in question such an allegation, in as much as the bare possibility of getting at the political opinions of 250 millions is something lying wholly beyond all European experience. It would appear to be a yet more pronounced impossibility in India, where the interpopular differences are deep-seated and wide-spread, where the tongues are multitudinous, the religions and races antagonistic, where the barbarian has not dreamed of political confederacy with the Babu, and where there exists no organised mechanism for concentrating the vote and

testing its validity. Mr. Hume, it is true, considerably modifies the original statement called in question by us. He puts the representation as "nearly, if not quite, one hundred millions of the population, and indirectly, the general sense of the people as a whole." There is a great modification here, and great indefiniteness, also. Even the "hundred millions," how did they cast the vote in testimony of delegation? It is not uncommon in England for men to stand up in the name of a whole class, and to declare themselves the representatives of a hundred thousand at a time. But the claim of the representation, of "a hundred millions" beats this hollow, and is calculated to send confusion among the arithmetics. Mr. Hume knows as well as we do that an overwhelming majority of our countrymen in India declare the alleged representation of the National Congress delegates to be a sham representation, got up at forced meetings, largely hole-and-corner, in the localities. It is asserted by them that the delegates "represent not a nation, but a party, recruited from certain small classes in a certain group of Indian nations." This is the belief, as far as we can make out, of an overwhelming majority of our countrymen in the East.

Mr. Hume further represents us as being "under the impression that it is absurd to speak of an Indian nation, because India is nearly as big as Europe, and includes numerous provinces whose people were at one time almost as distinct as those of France, Italy, Spain and Portugal." Now the truth is that we are not under any such impression for any such reason, and Mr. Hume misrepresents us in saying that we are. What we do maintain is that India is not, and never has been from the days of the Mahá Bharata, which were the days of Moses and Aaron, peopled by one nation. What we did say, and now repeat was that there never was in time an Indian Empire as now understood, till Great Britain created it. The provinces which Mr. Hume speaks of are mere political divisions created by the British Government for purposes of administration, and were never before united under one rule. "At one time almost as distinct as those of France, Italy, &c., !" To put it this way is to make light of the incontrovertible truth. The existing, enduring, and actual distinctions between the nations inhabiting India are out of all proportion to those between the European nations mentioned. There are, we repeat, nationalities in India speaking 106 different languages, a man of any being as incapable of understanding one of another as an Englishman who knows only his mother language is to understand a Russian. Among these nations some are highly polished and civilized, while others are almost as far back in savagedom, using stone weapons, as were the Cave men who dwelt in our own island when the woolly elephant was in it, and the hyænas and rhinoceroses used to come down to the Tyne to slake

their thirst. These nations of India are separated from each other by all the customs that separate civilization from barbarism. Their religions are the most antagonistic, and their race hatred the strongest on earth. What is more, the Hindu nation, which is numerically by far the strongest, is physically the weakest; and the chief justification for the British Government as it is, is the fact that it delivered and preserves the Hindu peoples from the merciless tyrants that ground them down for centuries to the gates of death. In India, also, there are still 117 native States under their own princes and with their own autocratic executives, but over which the British Government is the Suzerain Power, exercising a greater or less measure of control. Their populations number together not less than 50 million souls. Does Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea speak in the name of these 50 millions likewise, and of the potentates that rule them? The doctrine of Nationalities has been much discussed since Mazzini made it his cardinal doctrine. The definition of a nationality has long been in controversy. Let Mr. Hume search from John Stuart Mill and Deloche, and tell us if he can find a definition that will fit the 250,000,000 of India.

Mr. Hume brings us to book for saying that there is native opposition to the Congress. There is shameful falsifying in the reports, if the Muhammadan population be not generally in determined opposition to it—that is the men of influence among the Muhammadans. Mr. Hume says "there are few Muhammadans." Does he say it is not true that Muhammadans into the tens of thousands have signed against the Congress movement?—numbers extraordinary, considering that they are of an illiterate population. And what about the meetings, many thousands strong, that have been held against it at Allahabad, Lucknow, Benares, and elsewhere? Are we to understand him as including Sir Syed Ahmed and other distinguished Muhammadans that we mentioned among the "toadies to bureaucrats?" Then about the Rajah of Bhinga. We were well acquainted with Mr. Hume's opinion of this dignitary before reading the letter from him which we print this morning. But in spite of that we repeat, on authority not lightly to be cast aside, that this "new Government Rajah" is a Rajput by descent, that his cast ruled in India before the Mohamadans crossed the border, and his forefathers were men of rank under the Mogul. Mr. Hume, we firmly believe, could not find ten Anglo-Indians in Oudh to say that the Rajputs of the religion who go against the Congress movement are without influence among their countrymen.